REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 092 JC 670 787

CONFERENCE ON THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION. (LEHIGH UNIVERSITY, NOVEMBER 21-22, 1965).

BY- STOOPS, JOHN A. GUDITUS, CHARLES W.

LEHIGH UNIV., BETHLEHEM, PA.

PUB DATE 66

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.20 80P.

DESCRIPTORS- *JUNIOR COLLEGES, *HIGHER EDUCATION, *COLLEGE TEACHERS, TEACHER QUALIFICATIONS, COLLEGE ROLE, COMMUNITY COLLEGES, SCHOOL COMMUNITY RELATIONSHIP, BETHLEHEM, PENNSYLVANIA,

AT THIS CONFERENCE (NOVEMBER 1965), FOUR PAPERS WERE PRESENTED FOR DISCUSSION. TO BE RECOGNIZED AS A PART OF HIGHER EDUCATION, THE JUNIOR COLLEGE, LIKE THE REST OF HIGHER EDUCATION, MUST BE CONCERNED WITH SUBJECT MATTER IN BREADTH AND DEPTH, MUST BE INTENDED FOR ADULTS, AND MUST BE A PART OF THE COMMUNITY OF SCHOLARSHIP IN ITS TRULY LIBERAL SENSE. IT MUST HAVE (1) ARTS AND SCIENCES PROGRAMS TRANSFERABLE TO THE 4-YEAR INSTITUTIONS, (2) VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL PROGRAMS OF SUITABLY VARYING LENGTH AND CONTENT, (3) SOUND CAREER AND PERSONAL COUNSELING, (4) GENERAL EDUCATION AND SELF IMPROVEMENT COURSES FOR THE WHOLE COMMUNITY, AND (5) PROGRAMS AND SERVICES OF CIVIC ACTIVITIES. AS IN A UNIVERSITY, THE FACULTY MUST BE ABLE TO JUDGE ITS OWN COMPETENCE, BUT BECAUSE OF THE SPECIAL NATURE OF THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE, IT MUST ALSO DEAL WITH A WIDE RANGE OF STUDENT ABILITIES AND TAKE AN ACTIVE PART IN COMMUNITY AFFAIRS. FOR SUCH A VARIETY OF PROGRAMS, THE STAFF WILL OF NECESSITY HAVE A GREAT DIVERSITY OF BACKGROUND. SOME WILL HAVE ACADEMIC DEGREES AT VARIOUS LEVELS, SOME WILL HAVE PROFESSIONAL DEGREES, AND OTHERS, WITHOUT DEGREES, WILL HAVE GREAT COMPETENCE IN SPECIAL SUBJECTS. IN VIEW OF THE GENERAL SCARCITY OF COMPETENT TEACHERS, THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE APPEARS, AT LEAST FOR THE PRESENT, TO BE THE BEST TRAINING GROUND FOR ITS OWN FACULTY. (HH)

ED013092

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE IN HIGHER EDUCATION

ED013092

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
IN HIGHER EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

AUG 28 1967

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION

EDITOR	John A. Stoops, Dean, School of Education
ASSOCIATE EDITOR	Charles W. Guditus, Director, Community College Intern Program

---

Lehigh University Bethlehem, Pennsylvania 1966

JC 670 787

The Community College in Higher Education

This book is A Report of the Conference on The Role of the Community College in Higher Education held at Lehigh University November 21 and 22, 1965. The Conference was co-sponsored by Lehigh University, Rutgers University, The University of Maryland, the Commission on Higher Education of the Middle States Association, and the Junior College Council of the Middle Atlantic States.

CONTENTS

Foreword 5

Introductory Statements 7

Glenn J. Christensen
W. Deming Lewis

The Community College in Higher Education 9

Albert E. Meder, Jr.
Vice Provost and Dean, Rutgers University
Chairman, Commission on Higher Education,
Middle States Association

The Purpose of the Community College 21

Clyde E. Blocker
President, Harrisburg Area Community College

Program for the Community College 40

James F. Hall
President, Dutchess County Community College

Teachers for the Community College 51

John A. Stoops
Professor and Dean, School of Education
Lehigh University

Summary of Presentations and Discussions 68

Donald Deppe
Director of Institutes
University of Maryland

Appendices 74

Conference Participants
Conference Planning Committee
Conference Staff

FOREWORD

The Community College is one of the most dynamic movements in education today. Its potential for extending existing provisions for the spiralling educational aspirations of the American public is widely acclaimed. The question of whether or not it is higher education, however, frequently emerges as a topic of debate.

The purpose of this conference was to consider, at length, the issue of comparative status and to broaden the base of public understanding of this institutional model through responsible discussion. Efforts were not directed toward the establishment of a consensus, but rather toward the development of new insights into the commitments involved in the establishment of comprehensive community colleges. The conference represents an acknowledged responsibility on the part of the higher education community to provide a forum for discussions which lead all concerned to higher ground.

The Conference Commission is grateful to Lehigh University for providing the facilities and resources necessary to the success of this endeavor. The commission is also indebted to all who contributed by presenting papers, leading discussions as panelists, and especially to the many representatives of private and public agencies who indicated their interest in the issues under consideration by participating fully in the deliberations. It is hoped that the publication of these proceedings will prove helpful to all who share an interest and a concern for the future of the community college.

Charles W. Guditus
Lehigh University
Bethlehem, Pennsylvania

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENTS

To Open the Session

It is a distinct pleasure to call to order this first session of The Conference On The Community College In Higher Education. The pleasure lies not only in seeing so many leaders in education who thought the subject important enough to justify their taking time from their busy schedules to come here; it lies also in the even broader interest which was expressed in many letters sent to us in recent weeks expressing both regret that the writer was unable to attend but also recording his great interest in the conference and ordering copies of the Proceedings. These letters and your presence here tonight reflect the enthusiasm which the idea of holding such a conference generated at the beginning in everyone approached during the planning stage. I have never known another conference which generated more enthusiastic support. This was especially true of our co-sponsors, and since Lehigh, in the nature of things, acting as host may be more conspicuous than the co-sponsors, let me name them although they are on your program—Rutgers University, The University of Maryland, The Commission on Higher Education of The Middle States Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools, and The Junior College Council of The Middle Atlantic States.

During the several sessions of this conference you will meet the men who have been the agents by which these institutions contributed to the planning and to the implementation of those plans.

Glenn J. Christensen
Provost

A Word of Special Greeting

It is my pleasant task and purpose to welcome this conference on the Community College in Higher Education. From my point of view you are welcome in three ways.

First, and at the level of greatest generality, it seems to me that everyone in higher education should welcome the growth of the Community College Movement. All of us know the tremendous pressures for admission which our institutions are now undergoing. The explosion of population and the explosion of the need for more education in all segments of our economy can have no effect other than this. These pressures are growing and will continue to grow. The person with only a high school education will have a continually decreasing employment opportunity in the future. Our society must find the means to provide some higher education to all who have the ability to profit by it. Without substantial growth in the Community College facility of our nation we will be wasting valuable human resources, slowing down the progress of our economy and, most probably, laying the groundwork for a dissatisfied group of second class citizens. By providing adequate community colleges in the future we will have a more prosperous economy, a happier society and will be permitting the four-year colleges and universities to perform their own tasks with less distraction.

Secondly, and more specifically, I welcome this conference on this subject at this time, November, 1965. It is a timely conference to have in this part of the country, the Middle Atlantic States. It seems particularly timely in the State of Pennsylvania, which is just now in the process of developing a master plan for higher education. This is a plan which is much needed in this state which already has what I believe is a larger number of institutions of higher education for its population than any other state in the Union. As a member of the executive committee of the PACU, I have been exposed to a great deal of discussion about the forthcoming master plan for higher education. It is fair to say that some of this discussion exhibits a certain amount of apprehension about the possible future role of the community colleges in the state. In my opinion these worries are not justified. They most certainly will not be if the role of the community colleges is defined clearly as one of filling an obvious, large and rapidly growing gap in our educational system in this state, and if an effort is made not to over-supply responses to needs which are already being filled by existing institutions. It seems to me that this conference can perform a great service, not only to education in general, but also especially to Pennsylvania, and its upcoming master plan in particular, by clarifying this part of the problem.

Finally, I wish to welcome you most warmly here to this City of Bethlehem and tomorrow to the campus of Lehigh University. Our university has an intensive interest in Community Colleges. Our Department of Education is working energetically in this area and we are glad to have the privilege of having our staff and some of our graduates participate in this meeting. We are delighted to make our physical facilities available to you. Now that you know the way, we hope you will come back soon and often.

Dr. W. Deming Lewis
President, Lehigh University

THE COMMUNITY COLLEGE
in Higher Education

Albert E. Meder, Jr.

Dr. Glenn J. Christensen Presiding

May I suggest, if it did not appear to you at once, that you note the structure of the program. There are four principle papers. The first this evening on the community college in higher education will undertake to place the community college in the context of higher education throughout the country. The second paper will deal with the purpose, the function of the community college in that context and it will be followed by a panel providing opportunity for discussion from the floor at which the subject matter of these first two papers will be considered. At the luncheon meeting, after we have determined where the community college stands and what its purpose is, Dr. Hall will raise the question of what constitutes an appropriate program for the community college. The fourth presentation will consider the kind of teacher needed for that program and the ways in which such teachers can be prepared.

It was Voltaire, I think, who remarked that the Holy Roman Empire was neither holy nor Roman nor an empire. In much the same vein we may observe that the programs of a Two-Year Community College need not be two-years in length, nor oriented to the community, nor collegiate in character. Whatever may have been the case with the Holy Roman Empire, however, the Two-Year Community College should in fact be true to its name. Each of the three words is significant and important.

I do not mean to say or imply that every program or curriculum in such an institution should take precisely two years to complete, day or evening. Such a statement would manifestly be absurd. There will properly be programs of varying length, according to the needs of the students and the demands of the curriculum. I shall have something more to say about that a little later.

But the scope of activity of the type of institution we are discussing is fundamentally and significantly the two years immediately following high school graduation. The institution to fulfill its objectives should stake its claim in this area of education.

Doing so has at least four important implications, in addition to giving the institution an identity of its own, a rich lode to mine—to continue with the metaphor of staking a claim—and a criterion with which to judge the appropriateness and wisdom of its activities.

The two-year college is neither a four year college nor a pale copy of the first two years of the four-year college or any other part of it. By emphasizing its two-year organization the two-year college is set apart from the four-year college, as it should be.

This emphasis also sets the two-year college apart from the high school. Students do not attend a community college for the same reasons or with the same objectives that motivated a number of students a couple of decades ago to take "p-g courses" in high schools or, after graduation from high school, to attend a preparatory school for a fifth, post-graduate year. It is an institution distinct from the high school and should never forget this fact.

Neither is the community college a vocational school. To be sure, it is almost certain to have as one of its important objectives the preparation of students for gainful employment, but it does not exploit the same vocational areas, or if it does, it does not exploit them in the same way, as the vocational high school, even when the latter admits only or chiefly graduates of non-vocational high school programs.

And finally, even though the community college may in certain instances be organized under the Board of Education of a local school district by virtue of laws permitting such districts to offer thirteenth and fourteenth years of instruction, its status as a two-year college will protect the institution from thinking of itself as merely an extension upward of elementary and secondary education. It may well be that, but if it is not much more than that, it is inappropriate to think of the institution as a Two-Year Community College.

Moreover, the word *community* is important. Every educational institution serves a constituency. These constituencies vary. The obvious constituency of a state university is the state that maintains it, but this does not mean that its service and benefits are limited by state lines. The constituency of a college conducted by a religious order is sometimes only the members of that order, but more often goes far beyond that limit. Other church related colleges may or may not stress the church connection in defining their constituency. Some universities frankly regard themselves as serving a constituency that is national or even world-wide in scope.

The point is that every institution has a constituency. The constituency of a community college is the community, whatever that may be. It may be a geographical area. It may be in a highly specialized institution, a professional group regardless of geographical residence or employment. Typically, of course, in the two-year community college, the word *community* means a relatively small and reasonably well defined geographical area.

The implication is plain: what is appropriate for one community college may be completely inappropriate for another. The needs of the community determine the program, not a more or less inchoate understanding of what other institutions do. A proper emphasis on the word *community* provides both the origin and the justification for tremendous diversity, and when these colleges are effectively responsive, a matchless vitality. Community needs are not static, and a two-year community college that does not continually take its cue from such needs will not only be false to the trust imposed in it by the community, but will ultimately become moribund or worse.

But most important of all is the word *college*. It has already been pointed out that the Two-Year College has a role different from that of the high school, the vocational school, the public school, the four year college. That is all true. But none the less, the role of the two year college is that of a college.

The two-year community college is an institution of higher education. That is the theme of this conference, and in particular that is the thesis of this paper. Two-year community colleges are being widely discussed. Two-year community colleges are being established in relatively large numbers. Two-year community colleges have a most important and significant contribution to make to American education, but the actual accomplishment is dependent, in my judgment, upon their taking their rightful place in the main stream of American higher education. Anything less would be tragic. The high hopes that our citizens are obviously placing in these institutions will be frustrated and thousands of young people will be disappointed if the two-year community colleges choose either to find a quiet back water outside the mainstream, or to sail the less adventurous waters that are not higher education at all.

This is indeed a one sentence summary of all that has thus far been said and that remains to be said in this paper: unless the two-year community college is set up as a part of American higher education, the whole enterprise is vain. At this point in time in the United States of America, what is needed is not a mere upward extension of elementary and secondary education, not merely more preparation for more numerous and more varied and more novel jobs, not more conventional higher education for more youth, but a new kind of institution serving many more young people in new and newly developing ways, as a new kind of institution of higher education.

We have been through this before. Almost precisely a century ago, existing American institutions of higher education were inadequate to meet the needs of a burgeoning country. Oriented to classical learning, capable of receiving far fewer students than social needs required, inspired by limited objectives, the existing institutions had to be supplemented not only by more colleges, but by a different type of college.

The answer was found in the so-called Land Grant Colleges, established under the terms of the first Morrill Act, passed by the Congress and signed by President Lincoln during the dark days of the Civil War. This Act, as I am sure you all know, provided for a grant to the several states of certain public lands to be used in each state for "the endowment, support and maintenance of at least one college where the leading object shall be, without excluding other scientific and classical studies, and including military tactics, to teach such branches of learning as are related to agriculture and the mechanic arts, . . . in order to promote the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life."

While it is quite clear from this language that it was the intention of the Congress to provide a new type of institution of higher education—a college with a novel "main object," it is also clear that more than a declaration of legislative intent was needed to make these institutions in fact part of the community of higher education. That this was successfully accomplished is, from the vantage point of a century, abundantly clear; that it would be successfully done must have been doubtful at the beginning. The fact that the land-grant colleges became centers of agricultural research was no accident; before collegiate instruction could be adequately given in branches of learning related to agriculture such branches of learning had largely to be created. Such devotion to the creation of new knowledge as well as the transmission of existing knowledge is what saved the land-grant colleges from becoming technical schools of vocational agriculture. Here as in most concerns of importance, "the letter killeth but the spirit giveth life."

Just so will it be with community colleges. I speak as though these institutions were yet in the future, for they largely are, in our section of the country, even though there have been decades of experience with them, elsewhere. As we in these middle states move into this area of education, we must be consciously vigilant to see that they, like their land-grant counterparts a century ago, take their rightful place in the community of higher education. Less than unremitting conscious vigilance will not suffice, since it will be even easier for community colleges to slip out of the community of higher education than it would have been for the land-grant colleges to have done so.

How indeed will we know what to do, what to encourage, what to guard against? What are the criteria by which we may determine whether a two-year community college—or any institution for that matter—is truly a college or one falsely so called? What makes a school an institution of higher education?

I shall suggest the answers to these questions presently, but before doing so, and as a help to doing so, let us look a little more closely at the community college itself.

There are some who see the community college as the solution to all the current problems of higher education—which most certainly it is not. There are others who regard the establishment of junior colleges as an unwholesome dilution of the values of higher education, which is equally false. There are others who believe that the community college has an important and distinctive contribution to make, but that this will not come about automatically, and that there are pitfalls to be avoided and difficulties to be surmounted. This view is, I think, correct.

In the days when accreditation was first becoming an important force on American higher education, the object of the accrediting agencies was not so much to evaluate and signalize excellence, as it was to standardize colleges. By and large, four year liberal arts colleges, with a few notable exceptions, still largely resemble one another. There are differences, of course; but even today the likenesses probably outweigh the differences. The same subjects are included in the curriculum, the degree requirements are comparable, the distribution and concentration and elective requirements are quite similar—until very recently, even the academic calendars were very much alike.

Community colleges, on the other hand, should not resemble one another in such respects. It is implicit in the very name community college, as I suggested earlier, that the college exists to serve the needs of the community, and such needs will, in fact, differ as the character of communities differ.

Such differences will probably reflect themselves most obviously in the so-called terminal curricula: those courses designed to prepare the graduate for what is often called semi-professional employment. A community college should offer such courses, and they should, without doubt, reflect the employment opportunities of the community. But no narrow definition of community is necessary. To meet the needs of the community does not mean to be provincial. But one would not expect a New Jersey community college to offer courses in citrus fruit, and one would expect Atlantic rather Hunterdon to develop programs in hotel administration. Moreover, any New Jersey community college could well take cognizance of the fact that more industrial research laboratories are to be found here than in any other state, and set up programs to prepare research technicians and assistants.

There is a puzzling question that has to be faced in this connection: how is one to distinguish between technical or semi-professional programs appropriate for an institution of higher education and those vocational programs appropriate to a vocational high school. I shall return to this question presently.

Community colleges, too, should offer courses comparable to those offered in the freshman and sophomore years of a four-year college, so that graduates of the community college may continue their education in four-year colleges or universities. This activity of the community colleges—often called college-parallel courses—in the public mind often seems to overshadow that of the so-called terminal programs. This is most unfortunate. As a matter of fact, if a choice had to be made, the community college ought to lean toward the technical curriculum. This is the area in higher education that is sadly neglected, where there is great need, and where no institution other than the two-year college is likely to make any important contribution.

As a matter of fact, it will not be a question of choice, but of emphasis. Every two-year public community college will in fact find itself giving technical or semi-professional programs, transfer or college parallel programs, two-year programs of general education not necessarily designed for transfer to institutions offering more advanced work, and programs of adult education, perhaps largely of a non-credit character.

There are pitfalls with respect to the college transfer programs, too. The problem here is that of being certain that the institution is truly offering college work, not merely post-graduate high school courses. The same problem in another form faces the four-year colleges. As one distinguished college dean once put it, college should not consist of a freshman year followed by three sophomore years.

One of the advantages claimed for the community college is that the sudden break, the sharp discontinuity, between high school and college is minimized, and the student introduced to the more rigorous demands of more advanced work more gradually. This can be and usually is true, but it is also possible that the student may never be cut loose from the leading strings. A two year college, in both its technical and college parallel courses, must be more than the thirteenth and fourteenth grades.

One of the basic and fundamental misunderstandings often encountered in dealing with these issues is that they can be settled on the basis of chronology. A course taken after graduation from high school does not thereby become a college course. Some vocational school people seem to think that if they admit to some program only high school graduates, that program has thereby become a part of a technical institute, rather than a vocational school. Chronology, however, has nothing to do with the matter. If one studies ninthgrade algebra after he has graduated from high school, or even after he has graduated from college, it is still a junior high school subject. The converse is also true, as the Advanced Placement Program of the College Entrance Examination Board has abundantly demonstrated: students in high school can study college subjects successfully. They are still college subjects and deserve and are granted college credit.

But this view must not be pushed too far: What about elementary French? We teach it in high school and give credit for graduation from high school for it; we teach it in college, and give credit for graduation from college for it; many a graduate student has taken it—this time without credit—to meet his language requirements for the Ph.D. degree; and in France, babies learn it without a formal course at their mothers' knees.

Neither can the issue be determined by saying that secondary or high school education or vocational education is non-selective—that is to say, secondary education is designed to serve all the children of all the people; whereas higher education is selective—that is either through admission requirements or academic attrition higher education is designed only for those who can profit by it. And, say many who hold this view, since the community college by definition must serve its community and therefore cannot be highly selective, it cannot in fact be higher education.

I reject this straw-man utterly. Time will not permit me to deal with its fallacies adequately. The only point I want to make is that the difference between higher education and something else cannot be described in terms of those who are allowed to pursue it.

How then does one characterize higher education? It is not a question of subject matter or of teaching methods; it is not a question of the amount of responsibility placed on the student for his own learning, though that plays an important part; it is not a question of how many faculty members hold Doctor's degrees, nor even a question of the stated objectives of the program, though that comes closest to the heart of the matter. It is primarily a matter of climate.

The climate of higher education seems to me to be described by four principal characteristics, none of which is a characteristic of secondary education. First, higher education is intended for adults. College students are not boys and girls; they are men and women. Sometimes it is even a shock to the students—particularly the freshmen—to be so regarded. I remember one student who told the dean who was remonstrating with her about her behavior as unwomanly: "You know, I have never thought of myself as a *woman* before." A writer in a recent issue of a popular periodical pointed with scorn to a certain type of college where, he said, they know no better than to talk of the boys dorm.

Second, higher education is marked by a pre-eminent concern with subject matter. You remember the story of the school teacher who said she didn't teach history, she taught boys and girls. There is a sense in which this is an appropriate attitude in elementary and to a lesser extent in secondary education; it is wholly out of place in a college. The college professor of history is a historian teaching history. He is of course also interested in developing the intellectual powers of his students; it is likely that he cares about his students as persons; it is certain, however, that he is a subject specialist teaching a subject.

Third, higher education is concerned with both breadth and depth. There are maturing intellectual experiences that can come only from studying something in some depth, in having the experience of intellectual mastery, of digging out the facts for oneself and making himself master of them. The facts one will need in later life cannot be foreseen; but what can be foreseen is that if a person is to use his intellectual powers at all, he will have to use them with respect to new problems. What is important, then, is the experience of intellectual mastery, even of a small part of a small subject, not the particular facts by which the experience is obtained.

But with all this, he would be a sorry excuse for an educated man or woman who knew only history or mathematics, or chemistry, or what not. Breadth, too, is important.

Finally, higher education takes its place within a kind of mystical community, a community in which the scholars of the past walk hand in hand with the students, who are the scholars of the future under the guidance of the faculty, who are the scholars of the present. Nicholas Murray Butler, that great President of Columbia University, once said that somehow or other, through whatever field of study it might be, we should try to make every student understand that there is a great intellectual tradition, to lead him to feel the power and strength of it, to enter into it, and if it should lie within his power, to make it yet richer and fuller before he should leave the earth.

This is the authentic spirit of higher education. Such a spirit flourishes best in a community of scholars. It follows that that is what an institution of higher education must be.

If then an institution, be it a graduate school, or a four year liberal arts college; be it a professional school of law, medicine or theology, or a college of engineering; or be it a community college—if an institution wishes to be an institution of higher education, it must become in some manner and in some way and to some extent a genuine part of the community of scholars. There are ways by which this can be done, but this is not the time nor place to discuss them. The criterion however is the touchstone by which the faithfulness of the community college to its trust is to be judged.

The community college can take its rightful place in American higher education only if it takes its rightful place in the community of scholars. If it does that there can be no question either of its relevance or its excellence. The community college is established by a geographical and physical community in which it functions, and to whose service it is devoted; it is established in a philosophical and mystical community, through which it functions, and through devotion to which it is enabled to serve.

But is the community college to find its place in the community of scholars unaided? By no means. Here it seems to me is where the great regional associations of colleges and secondary schools, and particularly their accrediting commissions, have a major role to play.

Every new two-year college is naturally eager to earn accreditation, and the accrediting commissions are eager to see them do so. For this reason the Federation of Regional Accrediting Commissions has pointedly encouraged its constituent members to establish the category of Candidacy for Accreditation. The Middle States Commission, with which this group is principally concerned, has done so; indeed, the Middle States Commission encourages institutions to become Correspondents of the Commission at the earliest possible date—as soon as they have been officially chartered.

The purpose is solely to assist the institution; there is nothing in it for the Commission except more work. Let me amplify the Commission's view of the matter briefly.

The basic conditions of eligibility for accreditation remain unchanged: non-profit institutions of higher education are eligible to apply for evaluation and accreditation if their principal programs offer two or more years of undergraduate or one year of graduate work in the arts and sciences, and if they rest upon a base of liberal studies required of all or more students. Actual accreditation cannot take place until at least one class has been graduated, but the process may be commenced at any stage of the development of the institution after its governing board has been organized, even before it has admitted any students.

The first step is now called Correspondent Status. An institution becomes a Correspondent of the Commission by declaring its intention to seek accreditation and by establishing a consultative relationship with the Commission which will continue until accreditation is achieved. Correspondents receive the mailings of the Commission, send observers to the annual Convention, and benefit from the Commission's counsel through correspondence and occasional special projects and visits. They are expected to file annual reports of progress and catalogs and other significant documents as issued, assistance in obtaining consultants is available or official consultants can be assigned if requested.

The second stage, which is optional, is the status of Candidate for Accreditation. This requires examination and approval of an institution's basic structure, management, resources and general promise, and involves closer Commission oversight. Candidacy is specifically designed for institutions which need early recognition for recruitment or financial purposes or as a qualification for applying for Federal aid.

The institution seeking candidacy prepares a document setting forth its objectives, its control, structure, financial resources, relation to other agencies, projected academic program, personnel and facilities, and its development plans. It is visited by a representative of the Commission, and action by the Commission is required to grant the status of Candidate.

The Commission takes this matter very seriously indeed. Semi-annual reports are required of accepted candidates and a Commission appointed consultant visits the institution after each report, that is, twice a year. Lack of sustained and satisfactory progress necessitates withdrawal of candidacy. Acceptance as a Candidate for Accreditation is reported to the United States Office of Education, to the Education Department of the state in which the institution is located and orally in the annual report to the Middle States Association, but the names of candidates do not appear in the membership or accreditation list.

Recognition as a Candidate for Accreditation does not, of course, assure eventual accreditation. It does afford evidence that in the Commission's judgment an institution is so organized, managed and supported and appears to be so developing and staffing its program that normal progress toward accreditation seems likely. Candidate institutions are kept under very close scrutiny by the Commission.

The Executive Secretary's instructions to candidates as to their semiannual report are relevant to an understanding of the status. The institutions are told the report should be factual, comprehensive and quantitative when appropriate. It is to cover developments since the last report, the current state of the institution, and projected next steps.

As I have indicated, a consultant's visit follows submission of the report. The question to which the consultant addresses himself is important to both parties. He must ask whether the institution's progress is fully bearing out the promise which originally earned it candidacy status and to answer this he looks into everything time permits during his visit: clarity of objectives, the evolving organization and personnel, performance of the governing board, the faculty, the academic program, students if any, library facilities, external relations, financial support and the like.

The candidacy visitor is a consultant to the institution, to be sure, but he is also the Commission's representative, and at the time of each consultant's report to it the Commission must consider whether the institution continues to be so organized, managed, supported and developing that it may be said to be moving steadily toward accreditation.

Now let me turn back to that provision in the statement concerning eligibility for accreditation that "the principal educational programs should rest upon a base of liberal studies required of all or most students." I should like to discuss this aspect of the matter in some depth, as throwing further light on what is meant by the climate of higher education and the community of scholars.

Let it be noted at the outset that the provision does not prescribe or proscribe any particular program or philosophy or proportion of the program that must be devoted to liberal studies. Equally firmly, however, it takes the position that a base of liberal studies is essential the hallmark of higher education. It leaves to each institution the problem of working out the appropriate program in accordance with its objectives, the time available, and other similar considerations.

Most four-year institutions find little difficulty in accommodating themselves to such a requirement. Even the special purpose institutions almost universally do their best to include in their curricula as much liberal arts work as they can, and as for post-baccalaureate professional schools, almost without exception, they rest their programs on a base of liberal studies, usually required for admission.

The pinch comes in the two-year college, particularly in the so-called terminal programs. The role of the liberal arts in college-parallel or transfer programs can be determined easily. Here the two year college must emulate the four-year college. It is only proper for the former to be guided by the latter. The two-year college purports to do half of what the four-year college does; there is no possible excuse for not making delivery on the contract. The place of the liberal arts in this program is and must be pre-eminent, the scholarly competence of the faculty unquestionable, the foundation for more advanced work well laid, the general education objectives reasonably well attained — all of which is all any four-year college does. The two-year college may remonstrate with the four-year college if it wishes concerning their views, their requirements, their objectives; but it cannot honestly argue that it should have the right to determine their character. It stands vis-a-vis the four-year college precisely as that institution stands with respect to the graduate professional schools of law, medicine, theology, and the rest. In either case, if you want your students to get in, you do what they say.

But when it comes to the terminal programs, the story is different. Let me discuss first the non-technical, non-vocational, general education type of curriculum, not designed for transfer purposes. Here the two-year college not only can do as it pleases, but it should, and it should be encouraged to do so. Here a community college can devise all sorts of interesting and challenging courses—containing traditional subject matter in untraditional ways, making use of specialized local resources, letting creative imagination go where it will.

There must be some guide-lines, of course. Those who build the curriculum must themselves be aware of what the liberal arts are, and what objectives are sought through the study of the liberal arts.

Much has been written on the subject of the liberal arts, and more will be. For example, a year ago *Liberal Education,* the bulletin of the Association of American Colleges, was devoted entirely to "Reflections on the Role of Liberal Education." The reading of any one of the six papers will emphasize this idea: while all agree as to the climate, all emphasize different aspects of the ideal of an education suited for free men. One says our first aim should be "to teach students to distinguish between truth and falsehood, between sense and nonsense." The same writer says our second duty is "to turn their thoughts to matters which engage their curiosity, awake their imaginations, and enrich their consciousness." Another writer thinks we have been imaginatively rigid, and that interdisciplinary majors will serve better than the conventional pattern to attain the liberal arts objectives. Others discuss more particularly the role of philosophy, of the humanities, of science and of religion. I make no attempt to give a precis of all of these articles, or even of any one. I cite this one item in the long bibliography of liberal education to emphasize three points: first, as stated, liberal education is a climate not a curriculum; second, one who wants to find out what the climate is has ample opportunity to find out, and third, differing approaches are not only possible, but desirable.

In the occupational curricula, the liberal arts play still another role, and here, too, creative imagination is even more fully challenged. No one can argue that an occupational curriculum should not emphasize the development of appropriate occupational skills. Clearly it must. And usually such skills depend on the understanding of what is so unhappily called "related knowledge," that necessary culling from the academic disciplines those particular facts that must be known and possibly understood in order to undergird the occupational skill. My phraseology is not intended to decry such courses or such an activity; on the contrary, I mean to describe fairly what is done and must be done. But I have known of institutions that were desperately unhappy when an evaluating team denied that such related courses constituted liberal arts content in the curriculum. The facts taught came from an academic discipline, but the spirit came from the employment agency. Without the liberal arts spirit, there is no liberal education, despite the content.

Without something of the liberal arts spirit, even in an occupational curriculum, that curriculum is not a program of higher education; it is purely vocational. There must therefore be a part of every curriculum, no matter how technical, designed not for its contribution to technical skill, or even to technical knowledge, or to the student as an employable individual, but to the student as a human being in a free society—an aspect of his education that will sustain him if he is *un*employed.

To devise this part of the program is a great challenge, for there is so much that might be done and so little time in which to do it. The amount of time that can be allotted for this aspect of the curriculum is necessarily limited—perhaps 12 hours, with luck and ingenuity possibly 15, almost never as much as 18. What to do and how to do it is certainly not obvious, and there are surely no pat answers.

At the risk of belaboring the point, let me discuss it a little further. There are two major pitfalls. One is to assume that *any* course in the humanities, in philosophy, in history or the social sciences will satisfactorily meet the objective sought. In one sense, this view is correct: no subject needs to be excluded. But not just any course will do. I once had a colleague whose course in Music Appreciation consisted essentially in the memorization of the dates of birth and death of a large number of allegedly great composers. There was nothing liberalizing about *that*. A course in literature can be equally pedantic; I myself once had a grade lowered on a test in high school because I didn't happen to remember that a certain English writer, none of whose works we had ever read, even in excerpts in an anthology, was satirical. I never felt really properly chagrined about that particular grade. Mathematicians have little respect for what they call "formal" proofs; this is their word for an illiberal form of mathematics that is not the real thing.

The second pitfall is since time is short to establish a "survey" course. I cite a horrible example I found, not in a junior college or technical institute, but in the graduate offering of an institution that shall be nameless, a two-credit course entitled, "Political Theory from Plato to the Present-Day." No serious student can have any patience with such superficiality.

Let me append one final word on this theme, to encourage creative experimentation. Many of the best four year colleges are genuinely receptive to unconventional courses, and I am very sure many more will be, if the two-year colleges can convince them that in working out their courses, they have in fact provided a liberalizing intellectual experience in reasonable depth. But don't expect simultaneously to argue that freshman composition or a second year course in technical report writing, since they are in the area of "Communications," are part of the liberal arts core.

The real purpose of requiring the "liberal studies base" for accreditation as I see it, is to insure that the institution coming before the accrediting commission is in fact a bona fide institution of higher education. I myself stand firmly on the position that unless the program of an institution includes or rests upon such a liberal base, it is not in fact an institution of higher education. That goes for teachers colleges, engineering schools, business administration programs, and all the rest.

American higher education has great vitality and great diversity. It includes great universities with notable graduate and professional schools. It includes specialized schools devoted to limited objectives. It includes highly selective institutions, and those that are virtually open to all. It is an enterprise that baffles the foreign observer, and is often misunderstood by those who profess to be its friends. An effort to describe its details or to catalog its offerings is doomed to failure.

American higher education can only be understood if one looks at the great common characteristics of excellence, the climate of instruction and research and the community of scholars.

As the two-year community college takes an ever more important place in this great enterprise it has the potential to increase both its vitality and its diversity. In it the community of scholars makes contact with the larger community of all the people in a response to their needs. If the community college remains within the community of higher education, both communities will flourish to the enhancement of the public welfare. Indeed, just as the land-grant college added to the devotion to learning of the colonial college a concern for the liberal and practical education of the industrial classes in the several pursuits and professions in life through resident instruction, research, and extension service, and the state universities and state colleges went beyond this to "let each become all that he is capable of becoming," so the community college gathers up all of these strands to weave yet a new pattern, perhaps even with new fabrics and new looms, to serve the needs of the present day.

Thank you Dean Meder: You've launched our conference into orbit. We'll see how we continue our orbiting tomorrow and whether we will be able to make a successful reentry at the close of these deliberations. We want this conference to be on an informal basis. You are here because of a common interest. We hope that you will avail yourselves of every opportunity for discussion among yourselves, getting to know each other better, broadening your base of ideas for your work, and that you will raise questions of your specific interest during the panel discussion periods.

—Dr. Christensen

PURPOSE
# of the Community College

Clyde E. Blocker

The task of delineating the educational purposes of any institution is extremely complex. This is so because the American educational system is the outgrowth of historical antecedents which reflect the fundamental social and political beliefs of our entire society. Educational purposes are not readily amenable to "scientific" analysis but, rather, reflect individual value judgments. Thus, we find that our perceptions of what a particular educational institution should do may be at odds because of our perception of history, our personal experiences, and resulting personal attitudes.

In this paper we will attempt to look at the community college within a perspective of (1) complexity of the problem (2) basic philosophy, (3) educational purposes, and (4) a comparison of educational purposes of community colleges and universities.

The problem is complicated further by the fact that legally defined levels of education and resulting institutional forms have developed for administrative convenience and do not reflect mutually exclusive educational functions. When one examines the course content in some four-year colleges he will find that such content may be duplicated in many first class high schools. If he probed the reactions of the freshmen in a number of colleges and universities, he would find that they are in essence repeating segments of their secondary school courses during their first and perhaps their second semester in college.

The very size and complexity of the enterprise makes analysis difficult. There are over 1800 institutions of higher education enrolling approximately 5,400,000 students, and employing 415,000 faculty members in the United States. The entire gamut of post-high school education is represented: community colleges, liberal arts colleges, state colleges, public and private universities, and independent specialized professional schools. The variety of educational functions represented among these institutions is truly staggering. To mention only a few gives some idea of the vast range of programs available to the American public: remedial programs, technical and semi-professional education, vocational education, liberal arts and sciences, business administration, engineering, graduates and professional programs, and postgraduate study.

When examining educational functions we cannot ignore the vast social, economic and political changes which have taken place during the last twenty-five years. We live in a society which has a scientific and technological base of unprecedented interdependence. Higher education made such society possible, but as a consequence colleges and universities find themselves inexorably intertwined in the vortex of national and international relationships, governmental activities, and the affairs of business and industry. All levels of education have been deeply influenced by our rapidly changing social and economic structure, and will undoubtedly continue to make many functional and structural adaptations as the social environment experiences additional modifications in the future.

Last, when we think of education we are often misled by institutional identifications which lead to the erroneous conclusion that there is no meaningful relationship between the elementary school and the college, or the secondary school and the graduate or professional school. This false conclusion becomes obvious when we examine education from the standpoint of the development of the students. From the viewpoint of the students, education from the elmentary level through the graduate school does not differ in substance but, rather, in degree of emphasis. The somewhat over-simplified illustration below emphasizes the differences at various levels of education. The elementary school is concerned primarily with physical development, social skills, and basic intellectual processes. As the student progresses from the first grade to a terminal educational experience there is decreasing emphasis upon these three aspects and increasing attention to abstractions and nonverbal symbolisms.

An examination of educational purposes is meaningless without first establishing an acceptable philosophical base. The cross currents of American society are such that it is difficult, if not impossible, to achieve concensus as to a single acceptable philosophical position for public institutions. It is possible, however, to briefly touch upon four generalized categories of sociopolitical positions directly related to public policy and education.

The liberal and conservative positions are more representative of American higher education than any other. Generally, universities maintain a conservative posture with regard to educational policy. There is an interesting inconsistency here in that, in the last several years, most of the voices of dissent critical of American international and domestic policies, have originated on university campuses. University professors, however, continue to be consistently conservative in those areas which have direct impact upon their professional work.

The community college, on the other hand, generally fits into the context of a liberal educational philosophy. What does this mean? We will see when we examine educational purposes more specifically that the community college tends to be more interested in the development of people than in pure research and the development of new knowledge.

Let us put the matter on a more personal basis. Examine your own beliefs. Do you believe that too many young people are going on to college? That many of them would be better off and society would not be handicapped if they completed some sort of trade training or vocational training and immediately entered business, industry, or the armed forces? Do you believe

SOCIOPOLITICAL POSITIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR THE TWO-YEAR COLLEGE

	Radical	Liberal	Conservative	Reactionary
Attitude toward change	Rapid change	Gradual change	Maintenance of status quo	Regression to the past
Attitude toward governmental action	Highly centralized	Centralized for specialized and necessary services	Decentralized essential services for selective groups	Laissez faire
Implications for education	Educational programs for social reconstruction	Educational programs for gradual change	Educational programs for preservation of the culture	Educational programs for preservation of absolute values
	Directed curriculum for social objectives	Curriculum adapted to current problems and needs	Curriculum centered upon traditional subject matter	Curriculum limited to immutable truths
	Selection of students for social purposes	Self-selection of students	Selection of students on academic basis	Selection of students on academic, social, and economic basis

Clyde E. Blocker, Robert H. Plummer and Richard C. Richardson, Jr.
The Two-Year College: A Social Synthesis, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.:
Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965. p13.

that current practices of selective admissions to colleges and universities based upon high school records and standardized test results is the best method for selecting the future intellectual leaders and decision makers? Do you believe that "collegiate" study really means the liberal arts and sciences and does not include semi-professional training in nursing, business administration, and the technical engineering fields? If your answers to these questions are in the affirmative, you generally hold a conservative position with regard to higher education.

The liberal position tends to be more pragmatic with relatively less emphasis upon traditional concepts. The curriculum becomes the focus of the basic personal beliefs and if it represents the liberal position it is designed to reflect our heritage, but is adapted to current problems and needs. Above all, it is structured so that students will learn the processes of logical thinking and the application of knowledge in order to solve current problems. There is historical support for this point of view. John R. Hale has illustrated how education was adapted to the needs of the times during the Renaissance.

> Wealth, however, cannot buy culture, it can only buy its works. Culture is nourished by money, but its nucleus is a wider exposure to learning. During the Renaissance, to get rich and to stay rich required a relatively high standard of education. First and foremost, this education was utilitarian: a man could not be successful in commerce and industry without knowing how to read and write and being skillful at figures. But the ways of the Renaissance world required something further. More business meant more partnership agreements, more complicated wills, more conveyancing—in short, more law. Legal studies boomed steadily throughout the Renaissance, attracting the largest enrollment at universities, and causing professors of law to be paid among the highest of academic salaries. And as the city-states grew, the business of government became more complicated, creating a demand for a well-educated secretariat at home and for diplomats who could speak with persuasion and eloquence abroad.
>
> There was, then, a steadily increasing pressure for a more practical kind of education than the one provided by the theological studies of the Middle Ages. Professional skills were needed—also worldly attitudes. The humanistic program of studies took shape to provide them.

If we refer again to personal beliefs in order to find the liberal position, we would ask "Is education essentially utilitarian?". Should education continually adapt to changing conditions of its environment in a systematic way? Should relevant educational opportunities be extended to all on the basis of their abilities and their potential contributions to society. If you answer these questions in the affirmative, your attitudes approximate those who believe community colleges serve an essential function in our society.

John R. Hale, Renaissance, *New York: Time Incorporated, 1965, Pp. 14-16.*

The statement of educational purposes enunciated by Dr. Ferris N. Crawford, Associate Superintendent of Public Instruction for the State of Michigan, is one of the most comprehensive and concise outlines of educational purposes available in the literature. As he sees it, the college has five major responsibilities to its constituency: (1) liberal arts and science programs which qualitatively and quantitatively satisfy the first two years' work on the baccalaureate degree, (2) programs in technical and semiprofessional fields designed to develop occupational competence for individuals entering the work force or being retrained to meet changing job requirements, (3) continuing education in a wide variety of courses and programs for individuals of all ages, (4) guidance and counseling services for students regardless of age, and (5) cultural, civic and recreational programs for the enrichment of community life.

> . . . it is appropriate for community colleges to provide, for all persons above the twelfth-grade age levels, education consistent with the purposes of the individuals and the society of which they are a part, subject only to the restrictions in the state statutes . . . The educational needs appropriate for community colleges to fulfill *at this time* include:
>
> (1) The need for programs of liberal arts and science courses, usual to the first and second years of college, which will provide sound general and preprofessional education of such quality that credits may be transferred to a nationally or regionally accredited four-year college or university and applied towards degrees of the baccalaureate level or higher.
>
> (2) The need for vocational and technical programs in the trades, industrial, agricultural, and semiprofessional fields. Such programs may be of long or short duration, depending on the amount of time needed by the student to complete the requirements for entrance into the occupation.
>
> (3) The need for programs of courses for adults and other community college students, for which credit may or may not be given, designed to provide general education and to improve self-government, healthful living, understanding [of] civic and public affairs, avocational growth, constructive use of leisure time, personal and family living satisfactions, cultural depth, and to facilitate occupational advancement.
>
> (4) The need for individual services to students including guidance and counseling, assistance in career selection, removal of deficiences in preparation for college programs, personality and health improvement.
>
> (5) The need for programs and services for individuals and groups interested in cultural, civic, recreational, or other community betterment projects.

Ferris N. Crawford, "A Twentieth Century Institution: The Community College." Address delivered at Southwestern College Agreement Conference, Battle Creek, Michigan, November 16, 1961.

It should also be noted that Crawford confines the activities of the community college to individuals who are beyond high school age. This is a rather important distinction. In the view of a few individuals acting as spokesmen for community colleges, there is no substantial difference between the work of this institution and the secondary schools. Granted, the college may offer subject matter content which is both secondary and collegiate level, however, it is clear that society makes a sharp distinction on sociological and psychological grounds between secondary and collegiate education.

A second point must be stressed. Crawford also maintained that the community college must be flexible in its responses to social and personal needs. He emphasizes this point when he says ". . . the educational needs appropriate for community colleges to fulfill *at this time* include . . ." He is saying here that community colleges must develop, maintain and revise educational programs as social and economic needs change in time and place.

These five interrelated but distinct functions constitute the idealized pattern of education services in the community college. Perhaps a sharper portrait of the community college can be painted if we contrast these five functions with those ordinarily associated with a university. Dr. James Perkins, President of Cornell University, recently defined the role of the university as a triangle of research, teaching, and public service. In his view, the university is responsible for the generation of new knowledge through pure and applied research. Within the context of this primary responsibility is developed new knowledge in all the major academic disciplines. Thus, we find that the major effort of many university professors is pure and applied research and the publication of the results thereof.

Public service includes consultation with business, industry, and government. The third side of the triangle is teaching, which with senior professorial ranks is generally confined to upper division and graduate level courses.

As we compare this role with Crawford's statement of purpose we find a rather clean delineation between the university and the community college. First, the community college emphasizes the teaching responsibility whether it be in traditional liberal arts courses, semi-professional fields, or continuing education. The community college recognizes that greater emphasis must be placed upon student guidance than is ordinarily accepted on the university campus. The relative immaturity of students and their need for help in making far-reaching career and personal decisions amply justify such concern for guidance and counseling.

The contrast continues in community or public service, although faculty members are encouraged to participate in community activities and affairs, such relationships are generally confined to a sharply circumscribed geographic area in immediate proximity to the college. University personnel participate in activities on the national and international scene.

This analysis of functions should make it clear that the community college is not and cannot be all things to all people. Differentiation of educational programs these days begins in the early years of the public schools. Although students may appear to complete the same sequence of elementary education regardless of achievement and ability this is simply not true. There are wide disparities among students and their ability to master abstract materials by the time they have finished the sixth grade. In modern public schools such differentiation becomes more marked in the junior high school and high school so that students in these grades will range in actual ability and achievement from the high school dropout to the accelerated "gifted" student.

Diversity of student ability and achievement brings us to one of the central issues of community colleges today: "the open door" admission policy. It is widely believed that community colleges admit all who apply without regard for previous academic achievement and other pertinent criteria. Colleges having quality educational programs do not indiscriminately admit students to specific curricula without regard to their individual academic records. Rather, students are carefully screened before being admitted on the basis of high school records, test scores, and an individual interview.

Perhaps the best example of the importance of selective admissions to a particular program is the professional nursing course. This program was introduced in the community colleges in the early 1950's. From its very inception, relevant standards for admissions were established and applied. There is little question that the rapid expansion and unusual success of two-year nursing programs can be attributed, for the most part, to careful selection and admission of students. It is important to note that criteria used matched the abilities of students with academic and occupational requirements. All qualified students were given an opportunity to enter the program, but individuals who seemed to have little prospect for success were redirected toward more realistic educational goals.

The uniqueness of this concept of admissions can perhaps be clarified by another comparison with the university. In theory at least, the university sets up admission requirements for training for the professions. If the applicant cannot meet minimum requirements he cannot be served and he must find another institution which is adapted to his needs and abilities. The community college offers a wider range of alternatives in curricula in which students of differing interests and abilities can prepare for semi-professional and technical occupations.

The community college is a young and viable institution. It will make its most significant contributions to higher education through curricula and structural innovations. These two aspects of the educational processes are simultaneously the most important and the most neglected. There are only a few exceptional four-year and two-year institutions which have demonstrated that the teaching-learning process can be facilitated and enriched through the application of new concepts and procedures. Such experimentations in curriculum and instruction should be the hallmark of the community college.

In general, colleges have not seriously analyzed administrative structure and its implications for the teaching-learning process. Little has been done to adapt the traditional departmental organization of colleges to new forms which would stimulate a more effective academic program for students and faculty. There is certainly nothing sacred about the traditional line staff organization of colleges and there is little empirical evidence to demonstrate that such administrative organization is the best that can be found.

Technical and occupational programs will, I believe, be the focus of such efforts. This does not mean that course content in the liberal arts must remain static *ad infinitum.* Perhaps the ideal curriculum for the semi-professionals would be a hitherto new blend of content from the liberal arts and material with direct relevance to the occupation for which the student is being educated.

Community colleges must find faculty members who can provide strong academic leadership in classroom instruction. They must be sufficiently imaginative to understand and adapt technical equipment and academic content in such a way as to stimulate more effective and efficient learning on the part of the student. Although it is easy to say that faculty members should be instructional leaders, it is far more difficult to find and train individuals for such a role. I am optimistic enough to believe that this most fundamental and laudable objective can be achieved.

PANEL DISCUSSION

W. ROSS YATES, *Presiding*

Participants: Charles Simpson; Dr. Allen Bonnell; Dr. W. A. Brown; Jesse Barnet.

MR. CHARLES SIMPSON: I want to point out that Pennsylvania can have no pride, or no great pride, in its community college system. I make that declaration because Pennsylvania didn't even enact a Community College Law until 1963, and I make it also because we are in the academic year 1965-66, more than two years later, and we have only 4,000 students in Pennsylvania's four community colleges. This is an entirely insufficient number in 1965, and we Pennsylvanians and all others that are interested in education of youth in this region should want to see that improved.

There are a number of things in the way. There is, of course, a little bit of inertia. There is also a certain laxness on the part of the Commonwealth (all public utterance notwithstanding) to provide the money and the facilities. This is a good place, I suggest, to call for education radicalism. There is need for more action and more thinking which leads to bigger action in the development of our community colleges.

The second point that I want to develop is that the State of Pennsylvania has no master plan for higher education. What goes on in this State is by happenstance, by politics, by tradition, by all kinds of things—by anything except a well defined, well coordinated educational plan. When, in 1963, the legislature of Pennsylvania established a State Board of Education there were enacted two councils, one for basic education, one for higher education. It mandated that the council of higher education should prepare a master plan for higher education.

The Lord knew, and even the legislature knew, that Pennsylvania needed a master plan then and now needs it even more. It is likely to see the light of day, in public print, within the next three, four, or five months; but it won't really be a master plan until it has been received by, endorsed by, the

Governor and the legislature. Then we can begin to see the role of the community colleges *vis-a-vis* the state colleges, the Penn State University with its eighteen so called commonwealth centers or extension centers, the various private educational institutions, the independents, the church related or non-church related, and the scholarship system which now seems to be making its advent in Pennsylvania.

DR. ALLEN BONNELL: There are ties between the new community colleges, junior colleges, and existing four-year institutions. I am very sensitive to these. I have spent thirty-three years in higher education and only seven months of that time in the community college. In the administrative sense I've just dropped in, but I've taken a part in developing the purpose of the community college in Philadelphia for the past ten years.

The link that the community college has with the four-year institution is a link under duress. Many of our young people aspire to go on and get diplomas and baccalaureate degrees. We, therefore, have to mind our *P's* and *Q's* so that we do not offend those four-year institutions to which our students may ultimately want to go. It takes a little bit of negotiating to get properly articulated with the four-year institutions.

We have to prepare our students in the college transfer program for transfer to the four-year institution. The selling job is not always easy, but there *is* an area in which the community college has a great deal of freedom. The community college does not have to send all of its people on to a four-year institution. One of its great purposes may be to go back to original education. We need not be fooled by the "sheepskin psychosis." There are values to be had in education short of a baccalaureate degree; these values are purposeful and direct.

There is a special need in the urban industrial section for the type of education that the community college uniquely provides. It has freedom also from the technical ground rules of the traditional college, and they're awfully silly ground rules, aren't they? Why do we insist that the only legitimate way for a young person to get a baccalaureate degree is to come in and take five courses simultaneously for four years? Is that the way the human being is constructed? Why can't he take one course at a time, why he can't take ten years? I think we have the freedom in a community college which is geographically accessible to great numbers of young people to have them move at a pace which their counselors think is best for them. Isn't it better to do one or two courses in depth than to fritter away your time taking four or five courses simultaneously?

There is also a special need to serve the unselective. Colleges and universities are increasingly selective. When the faculty of a college or university teaches in absentia, this may be better for its students, for they are going to learn despite everything teachers can do. They learn despite your teaching, not necessarily because of it. These are the select students. The community college, by and large, is not going to be that selective. But God must have loved the unselected, because ninety per cent of our students are the unselected. This is the group with which the community college, particularly in suburban and industrial centers, is going to be working.

Another great challenge for the community college is linked to the art of education as self-education. In the urban industrial center we have the opportunity to be available to people during all of their lives. They can come back and fill their wells; they can open new windows; they can see new horizons. This is one of the great challenges of education to which the community college can respond. It seems to me that the community college is in an unique position to render this needed service to the public.

Dr. W. A. Brown: One thing that comes to mind whenever you speak of the evolution of community colleges in the United States is the familiar theory which has been called "the evolution of a new idea." It starts off with phase one, "It's a ridiculous idea, it'll never work." Contrasted, phase two says, "This idea has a little merit, but the time is not quite right." The third phase is "Well, it is a pretty good idea, but it wouldn't work in this region very well." And the fourth phase, after an additional passage of time, "This idea was a stroke of genius and I was in favor of it all along."

And I'd like to say that I've been in favor of community colleges all along.

I have four basic points on the purposes of the community college. First of all, woven throughout its entire philosophy, is the assertion that it provides higher education for youth and adults. One thing we often forget to say is that the community college has stressed an obligation to provide this education for youth and adults who cannot afford a university education. This doesn't mean that it is a poor man's college; neither does it mean that it is, ideally, democracy's college (whatever that might be). But it *does* mean that we are a kind of "bootstrap" college. I don't know if we have any sociologists present, but I'd like to coin the term "bootstrap collectivity" to describe the way the community college gathers the talent from the "other side of the track" that it has been serving for so many years. Herein is a tremendous brain-power pool for the United States. I shall allude to this again later. However, that is our first purpose—to provide opportunities in higher education for all Americans who are within the appropriate scope of aptitude and ability.

Secondly, we want to provide curricula which reflect the needs of our own constituents. This is because we are locally sponsored or at least state sponsored. We relate these colleges to the residents of our respective regions. How do we do this? We study local educational problems. At last we attempt to study them with the flimsy kind of research techniques which we now have. We must be cognizant of our manpower need and as someone has said, "The manpower needs change constantly; and, therefore, the community college curriculum must also be constantly evolving."

We get involved with the terms *technical, transfer,* and *terminal.* I don't think any of us can really define what a terminal student is. When a person is a student he is never terminal in learning. He may be terminal in the classroom, but the chances are that he'll come back and take another course next year, or maybe he'll be out for five years. He may then return to participate in an evening extension program which does not carry credit. Does this make him terminal? Does it make him a transfer back to his own institution? We waste a lot of time on these terms. So my second point is that the college should develop curricula which continuously reflect the constantly evolving needs of the constituents.

Thirdly, another primary purpose is providing a climate for scholarship. Community college students are not second class citizens in the academic community; and, if this happens in a particular community, then such students are not part of a good quality comprehensive community college. On the other hand, a second class climate will not produce first class citizen scholars. I don't mean that we have to duplicate all of the fine aspects of the educational environment, all of the symbols of the academe such as we find on a campus such as this. But it is a mistake to allow community college programs to exist in the back ends of factories, in condemned schools, in basements, in loft buildings, etc. As you all know, they exist in this way all over the country. I am not opposed to getting them started in these facilities, but I think it criminal to allow them to continue indefinitely under those circumstances.

Fourthly and lastly, the community college is admonished to "know thyself." What do we mean by that? We've heard about research, we've heard about diversification of curriculum, and we've heard about reflecting community educational needs. A college is a collection of scholars; we have to look at an atmosphere, create a climate which the scholarship of the past is presented, evaluated, and added to by the scholars of the present, and passed on to the scholars of the future.

However, we can't do this unless we know our own students. Who are these scholars? Community colleges are lax in their use of research funds. We're not doing much local research. Very few of us actually study our students. I've heard community college presidents, on numerous occasions, make absolutely ridiculous statements about the characteristics of their students. I refer to aptitudes, basic abilities, and socio-economic characteristics. Many college authorities simply do not know what the students are like on their campuses.

It doesn't require a large foundation grant to conduct studies of student aptitudes. Are terminal students less intelligent? Do they have lower aptitude scores? Do they have lower basic ability scores than transfer students? We should study the aptitudes and basic abilities of our students. We should study the socio-economic background of our students. When we consider the backgrounds from which some of them come, we are truly amazed at their achievement. We should look also at the value systems which are reflected in their socio-economic backgrounds. We should follow the progress of our transfer students. Having done two such studies, I can tell you the registrars at the four-year colleges are very cooperative. So long as the design of the research is a simple one, they will help the investigation in every way they can.

Our students succeed as scholars, but when they get to graduate school they don't carry a banner saying, "I started out in a community college." They know there are those who would not understand what this meant. Follow the progress of your transfer students. You'll find a well full of valuable information. All of this applies also to the graduates who enter industry.

In addition to studies of students and graduates, we should perpetually investigate new techniques of teaching, of evaluation, and of developing the appropriate education environment. We don't need newness for its own sake, but we need new and more efficient ways of teaching the increasing population of college students. We don't need blind repetition of the past either.

The community college is developing new techniques for higher education. Through such research it can make an even more significant contribution in the future.

MR. JESSE BARNET: The assignment of the panel was to react to Dr. Blocker's topic, "The Purpose of the Community College." I would react briefly through a topic of my own, "How Does a National Professional Organization Serve the Colleges which Serve the Students?"

Our organization is known as the American Association of Junior Colleges. Our members are primarily the colleges themselves which join as institutions to cooperate with other institutions on projects, commissions, and activities. An increasing number of universities, state departments of education, boards of education, and state planning commissions seek our advice and guidance on state legislation and community college presidents. Community colleges in Pennsylvania, few though there may be, have made use of our services. We have a growing staff because of our responsibility to a growing movement.

Five years ago the only foundation which really believed in us as an Association and in the community college movement was the Kellogg Foundation. It gave our organization a grant of $500,000. It also established university centers for the preparation of community college administrators.

Kellogg recently announced a new award of $782,000 to the Association over a five year period. Its purpose is to establish three task forces in the areas of medical, engineering related and business related technologies. We hope it will result in assistance to colleges in designing curricula in those fields. We hope to develop publications to help convince guidance counselors on the secondary school level that all technical education is not in a four-year engineering school. Perhaps Johnny should be an engineering aide and might find his niche in a community college program.

The Association is just completing a study of student personnel programs in community colleges, both public and private, which was conducted under a grant from the Carnegie Foundation. We have just received a grant from the U. S. Steel Foundation for study of issues affecting faculty in the two-year colleges and also recently received an initial grant from Educational Facilities Laboratory to help establish a Facilities Information Planning Center within the Association. We are about to participate in studies of income and expenditure patterns of publicly supported junior colleges and community colleges on the basis of a national sampling. In this latter investigation, a particular college will be the financial agent; we will serve as the intermediary with the Office of Education.

Finally, I will turn again to the area of legislation. We have finally decided there is much legislation that the American Council on Education through its normal report on federal programs which affect all higher education just can not include. So the Association has initiated its own Federal Affairs Reporting Service which is designed to provide help and specific information on legislation that affects community colleges.

Questions to the Panel

This concluded the remarks by members of the panel. Questions and discussion followed. The session opened with a response by Dr. Clyde Blocker to a question on non-credited courses in the community college:

DR. BLOCKER: One of the problems in education, particularly higher education is our failure to develop an adequate critical literature which can lead to fundamental improvements. Too often community college people spew out cliches about being all things to all people and about having these wonderful programs. However, if you read a publication called *Islands of Innovation,* a national study for which the author traveled around the nation to talk with community college leaders, you will find a well supported conclusion that community colleges are not meeting their obligation to experiment.

Secondly, in my opinion, most community college people have really not used much imagination in establishing programs which are both psychologically and academically sound, which will take the young people from where they are, regardless of their level (with the exception of the very bottom of the stack) to where they should be. By examining credit and non-credit developmental programs, I find very few students have succeeded in making the jump from a developmental program in English, for example, to English composition at the collegiate level. We really should be doing better.

Question: DR. DOLORES KELLER, *Farleigh Dickinson University:* I think we all agree that the primary function of a community college is teaching. I'm a little concerned about the undercurrent implicit in some of the comments. Something has been left unsaid. Perhaps you could take this a little bit further for me. For example, you say that teaching is the main function of the community college in contrast to the university which is discipline oriented. Am I reading too much into that "in contrast"?

DR. BLOCKER: In my brief experience at the University of Texas, there was too much teaching in absentia by full professors. I know this is also true of other institutions with which I'm intimately acquainted. The burden of teaching particularly in the lower divisions is not carried by fully qualified holders of the doctorate. It is carried by graduate assistants, and part-time lecturers. In a study which I completed recently, it was found that a very high proportion of the people in English who taught at a particular university were in some cases bachelor degree holders working on their master's degree, in other cases holders of master's degree working on the doctorate.

You are touching on this very intimate question of the relationship of research to teaching. Let me give you a more specific reply in terms of how we organize our faculty rank system. It is established on the basis of increasing increments of experience in teaching or in industrial business experience plus the basic education requirements. Starting with the master's degree in a subject matter field, we advance from the assistant to associate and to full professor. Correspondingly we increase the number of academic years in a subject matter field to a master's degree, a master's plus 30, a master's plus 45, and a master's plus 60. In our particular situation, there is not a specific doctoral requirement. We believe that preparation in a specific subject matter area with these added levels of recognized credit hours constitutes a basis for keeping teachers up to date and well-established as subject matter specialists.

It is important to note that we didn't put the doctor's degree in the requirements for full professors. My opinion is that the doctor's degrees probably would be and should be absorbed by the four-year colleges and universities. Although the community college can include a number of such individuals, it should not strive to have a full doctoral faculty.

Question: DAVID CROCKET, *Assistant Dean for Academic Affairs, Lafayette College:* So far in this discussion you put the university on one side and the community college on the other, particularly with reference to teaching as contrasted with research. Right down the middle between the two is the whole gamut of liberal arts colleges. As far as you people are concerned, you talk in terms of competition, but the competition is with this group in the middle. I think this is a very important area for all of us to think about.

DR. BONNELL, *President, Philadelphia Community College:* In this connection, while there are many liberal arts colleges in the urban centers, and this is certainly true in the Philadelphia area, there are not enough such colleges to accommodate the large numbers of people who are concentrated in that area. You are right, there is competition, for students between the four-year liberal arts college, and the community colleges. There is certainly competition in terms of price, because in Pennsylvania a community college student is actually paying only a third of the cost. However, there is strong probability that many of the graduates of the community college will go on to a four-year institution. This community college experience is going to help rather than hurt the liberal arts colleges.

DR. MEDER: I'd like to get into the act at this point, if I may, and I'd like to concur with my colleague from Lafayette. I think we're setting up a false economy in these triangles for the university and the community college. The triangles are not fully descriptive. It is perfectly true that the university triangle rests on the base of research, and we are right in describing the community college in the way in which we did. But the thought occurs to me, too, that the four-year college is not a university; it makes no pretense at being a university.

I've been thinking about how you describe that triangle. The three sides of the liberal arts college triangle are traditionally teaching, scholarship, and what I would call student relations, rather than guidance. Guidance has a rather formal sound to it. The four-year college professor wants to influence and help his students, but he doesn't do it through a formalized guidance program. I won't say whether the base is teaching or the student relations or scholarship. But the three are there, and you can choose your own base.

When analyzing how the community college compares with the four-year institutions, it is better to look at this new triangle rather than to look at the community college *vis-a-vis* the university. The college emphasizes scholarship, not necessarily research. Scholarship does not have to result in a disciplined research project. It may be in the form of institutional study or research that finds its outlet in changing of the course program. It may be reflected in what goes on in the classroom, rather than what's published in learned journals.

The thing that concerns me about the community college triangle is that "the well is going to run dry" if you emphasize teaching, public service and guidance, thereby omitting scholarship. In six or seven years a community college loses vitality unless its professors attend to their own scholarship. It doesn't matter if they are in disciplined research or simply attending a summer institute. If they teach in a community college which is going to stay in the community of higher education they must understand that their scholarship is needed to keep it a member of that community in good standing. We can not, then, fill that triangle with out-going guidance, teaching, and public service. There must be input as well, or we will have the same situation we faced in rebuilding the curricula of the secondary schools where teachers were scared to death of new knowledge because they had not really studied anything in the twenty years since they graduated from college. Fortunately, for secondary education, the government made possible institutes for in-service education and this situation has made a turn for the better.

This is the point which must be made. It can't be both ways. You can't criticize the university for having its lower division courses taught by graduate assistants, and then say that you aren't going to have Ph.D.'s on the faculty of the community colleges. You are talking out of both sides of your mouth at once. I don't think that you need a big faculty of Ph.D.'s at the community college, but without faculty scholarship you can't have a college that will remain a college for very long.

Question: MR. GRUBBS: Do any of the men on the panel have evidence that the community colleges drain off any of the financially able students from the four year colleges?

DR. BROWN: Yes, it happens often. I think in every class we have youngsters from the "affluent side of the tracks." But in almost all of these cases, they come to us for a specific reason usually related to the local aspect of our operation. For example, we do get some who could afford to go away to another college, but for some reason should stay home for another year. We also get a number of students who have gone away to a four year institution and have failed for some reason to make a successful adjustment there. In my experience many become very successful students in the community college.

MR. BARNET: A very important study related to this issue was done at Fresno Junior College, California. I think I have the figures generally right. All of you know the California pattern, where the twelve and one half per cent of the graduating class are automatically eligible for admission to the university, the top third are eligible for admission to the state colleges, and everybody eighteen years old who has graduated or who can benefit from instruction can attend the junior colleges. One year they accepted two hundred and fifty students who were not eligible for either the state colleges or the universities. Of those two hundred and fifty in the entering freshman class, one hundred and seventy actually graduated from the junior college. Of those one hundred and seventy, one hundred and ten transferred to a four year institution, and of those one hundred and ten, ninety graduated. They received the B.A.

The question is quite obvious. If we did not have the junior college, what would have happened to those two hundred and fifty, to ask it in another way, those ninety who received the baccalaureate degree.

ARNOLD FLETCHER, *West Chester State College:* I have two or three remarks, and I may ramble just a little, but I will get to what I consider the basic issue. In "tossing around" our equilateral triangle, we seem to have neglected the element of learning. We talk about research, teaching, and guidance, but I think at the base of these there is some kind of learning taking place. We may have to build many kinds of structures to implement learning.

This conference is devoted to the community college in higher education. Pennsylvania, New Jersey, Delaware, and Maryland are just beginning to move into community college development. If we consider the community college as a form of public higher education, which it is, we must look at the movement in relation to the complete development of higher education not only for the present but also within the context of the kind of higher education we are going to be having in the next ten to fifteen years.

Most of the statistical studies predict that the seventy-five to eighty per cent of the youngsters of college age are going to be going into some form of public higher institutions by 1980. To me this is rather significant because unless we do something to bring our house in order we are going to have a "mish-mosh" or "hodge-podge" of higher education patterns. This is not how best to serve society.

It goes back to Mr. Simpson's statement that in Pennsylvania, for example, we need some kind of a master plan of higher education. I look at the triangle more as a pyramid, the base of which is a community college and the middle is the four-year college. Overlapping with this space is some form of smaller state university with the large state university at the top. In that conception there is a role for all kinds of institutions.

It's natural that there are going to be changes. I think that the points that we should address ourselves to now are problems such as program offerings, types of faculty, and kind of training for faculty. I'd like to ask Mr. Simpson for his reaction.

MR. SIMPSON: Well, you and I think too much alike for your remarks to be commented on by me.

DEAN YATES: After we heard a brilliant talk last night we adjourned before anyone had an opportunity to ask Dr. Meder any questions. There is a request from the panel if Dr. Meder would respond to a question or two.

Question: MR. BARNET: We've heard this morning that the community college has freedom, and I agree, but do we have this freedom to exercise in relation to the requirements of the four-year institutions to which our students transfer. Dr. Blocker has said, "Let us be judged on confidence, not on credit hours." My question to you is: "Did I hear you rightly last night when I thought you stated that it would be in the area of 'terminal' or 'general' education that genuine experimentation would be possible and looked upon favorably by the regional accrediting agencies?" Is that what you said, is that what you meant, would you amplify this?

DR. MEDER: Well that was not quite what I said. I attempted to develop the contrast between the freedom of the community college in its non-transfer courses and as compared to the so-called "college parallel" courses, but I quite agree with my friend, Dr. Brown, that "parallel" is the wrong word altogether.

It is true that I said the community college has a matchless opportunity to experiment with curriculum and organization of subject matter in novel courses, the non-vocational courses. The community college is made to order for them. The community college also has a great opportunity to experiment with the terminal courses, where there is so much to do and so little time in which to do it. But I certainly didn't mean to say that there was no opportunity to innovate, no freedom to experiment, in organizing subject matter for transfer. Indeed, I think there is a section in the formal address in which I said, "Many four-year colleges do welcome unconventional organization of subject matter, and even more of them will welcome it as more unconventional programs are presented, assuming that such programs are presented supporting a rationale for developing the objectives of the liberal arts in this new, novel and unconventional way." So I would say by all means the community college should experiment in this area. It is obvious that they will have to work out certain treaties or concordants with the receiving institutions, but this, too, is well within the realm of possibility. Again this assumes as valid the basic thesis which I tried to enunciate last night, that the community college is in the realm of higher education.

I had an experience some years ago serving on a high school-college committee trying to remove barriers between the high school program and the college program. We don't do as much of this nowadays as we did some years back. The chairman of this committee was a high school principal, and a rather belligerent one, who insisted on calling the committee the "blockbusting committee." Now the reason why it was the "blockbusting committee" was that the high schools had become tired of domination by the colleges. They were going to get rid of the college domination and tell the colleges what kind of programs they had to take. Now this attitude doesn't do any one any good. You must have a cooperative venture. If the community college is recognized as being in the context of higher education, then I haven't any doubt about the representatives of the four-year colleges and the universities sitting down with the leaders of the two-year colleges and saying, "Of course this sounds like an interesting approach and we'll try it out, then let's have some institutional evaluation on both sides and see how it works out."

Dr. Bernreuter, *Dean, Pennsylvania State University:* While Dean Meder is on the floor I'd like to comment on one of the very important things which he said last night. He's been kind of an "Indian giver," if I may be somewhat unkind. On the one hand he has said in your transfer programs you may experiment as much as you want but at the same time he has taken that away by saying, "But we are going to insist that you have a certain amount of traditional liberal arts material or we won't consider it higher education." Now I have a suggestion to make to the Middle States Association through Dr. Meder. It has been mentioned by two speakers this morning that there are different levels of abstraction in college and high school material. I think that this is the key to whether or not material is higher educational material or whether it is simply post-high school material.

At the present time the Middle States Association determines whether or not a program is a higher education program on the basis of whether or not it contains liberal arts content. Professor Meder himself, last night, pointed out instances in which liberal arts content may not be on the higher education level. The thing that makes a course a higher course instead of simply a high school course is the degree of abstraction which it involves. I think that the Middle States Association should let the community college be truly free in experimenting with transfer subjects by no longer asking them to demonstrate their operation on a higher education level by requiring the liberal arts courses. Instead they should insist that the courses, whatever their content, be on a higher level of abstraction.

It is a very, very conservative, almost a reactionary viewpoint of the Middle States Association to say, "The only true higher education is liberal arts higher education." Certainly a course in physics can be taught at a degree of abstraction which makes it entirely possible to judge it on its own merits.

Dr. Meder: I find it very difficult to respond to that because it is such a mixture of what I agree with and what I don't agree with. First of all I enter on my own demure. I never said a word about requiring traditional liberal arts. What I described were the conditions for eligibility for evaluation for accreditation, imposed not by the Middle States Association alone, but by the Federation of Regional Accrediting Agencies. Therefore these conditions stand as uniform requirements in all of the six regions into which the United States is divided for purposes of accreditation in higher education. Eligible programs must contain or rest upon a base of liberal arts required of all or most of the students. I went on to say that it should be noticed that a particular liberal arts content is not prescribed, and I must emphasize that I did not proscribe a particular liberal arts content.

On the point of whether a suitable level of abstraction in a subject which is not one of the traditional disciplines can constitute part of the "base of liberal arts required of most students," I think that the Middle States Commission would make its judgment on an *ad hoc* basis in the light of the evidence submitted. It is possible that a community college may ask us to regard a technological course, taught on an appropriate level of abstraction as having values ordinarily associated with traditional liberal arts. If an institution presented us with that, I think we certainly would accept. There are no rigid requirements in that area; so I would say, by all means, a community college should experiment along this line.

However, I must repeat what I said last night. Don't try to say that a course in technical report writing is taught on such a level of abstraction simply because it relates to the area of communication. This relationship alone does not give it status as part of the liberal arts base. On the other hand I think that you can have the course in thermo-dynamics handled so that it is just as liberalizing as a course in Shakespeare. A great deal depends on how it's taught. I guess, Dr. Bernreuter, that you and I are saying similar things from different points of view. Maybe the lines intersect instead of being askew. I hope so.

PROGRAM
for the Community College

JAMES F. HALL

As has been already emphasized in the keynote address and clearly outlined by the first speaker, there is a uniqueness to this exciting and emerging institution in higher education—the comprehensive community college.

Before I address myself to the topic of *educational programs* in community colleges, I would like to spend a few minutes with you in further "setting the stage," so to speak.

Education and educators can never separate themselves from society. This is especially true in our democracy. Public education in America has always meant opportunities for all and not for a particular segment of the population. This ideal is gradually becoming a reality with each succeeding year. The development is the publicly supported primary school, secondary school, and now the comprehensive community college is evidence of this upward movement of our people to receive the benefits of a democratic society. In a sense, the community college is as American as apple pie or baseball. It is linked to common folk. It is a third stage in the upsurge of the people of our democracy in their groping and reaching toward a kind of education that will sustain democracy and carry it forward.

American life in its complexity has created the need for a unifying factor within itself. This unifying factor is the belief in democratic universals and the opportunity for the individual to obtain economic security in a technical age. Certainly a partial answer to this need can be found in increased educational opportunities for our people.

The creation of this unifying factor in our society is accomplished not only by the development of educational opportunities; social and political opportunities are also needed. Cooperative community life is becoming increasingly difficult in our technological society. The role of the comprehensive community college, if successful in translating theory into practice, will be a leadership role at the local level in helping to create unity and cooperation. It is this theme that lies at the central core of community college philosophy. And as this idealistic theme becomes more of a reality in community center after community center, no two community colleges will be exactly alike. We may expect them to have reasonable and desirable variations, but we may hope that these variations will not violate any of the philosophy or basic principles which are inherent in the ideals of a college for all of the people.

One of the greatest contributions of the community college as it becomes a reality in more and more communities can be its reinforcement of the ideals of a democratic society. It is to be readily admitted that all institutions of higher learning in America have this same role to perform. What then is unique about the community college? This uniqueness can be best understood by a study of organization structure and curriculum patterns of the community college program. First, as they increase in number they will be answering the needs of a greater majority of the population, thereby assigning to them by their student population alone a more direct channel to society's problems. Secondly, they are by definition the "people's college" and in this sense, should belong to the people and be responsive to their demands and needs. Thirdly, they should be so structured within the community that they become a unifying factor for adult community activities, economic, political, and social. It has been pointed out frequently that American communities are changing to neighborhoods grouped around community service centers of large scope. For every such aggregate with a population of about fifty thousand, there is need for a community college. In addition to meeting the more specific and individual needs, another need must be recognized. Every such population aggregate living in social organizations should have a college or educational institution of its own as a catalytic agent for progress.

It is these factors, in addition to *curriculum patterns* of the community college program, that can set them somewhat apart from other institutions of higher learning in America. This separation is not one of great educational differences or clashing philosophies, or of quality or quantity, it is simply a uniqueness in sociological roles to be played. This concept is that democratic grassroots leadership in community life should in the future reside to a greater extent in community-centered schools and colleges. If what Peter Drucker says is true, that education is about to take over from the Welfare State as a basic commitment of the American people, and that this new phenomenon might well be referred to as the "Knowledge State," then the community-centered college must become a reality. It should be pointed out that the traditional four-year liberal arts colleges and universities, both public and private, are also developing an increasingly important role in community level societal leadership; however, due to their geographic location, traditional role of town and gown, and the nature of the their curricula, these colleges and universities will never be able to perform the community leadership role adequately. Their's is a national and international leadership and is most important in its own right. The Strayer Committee in California in 1948 carefully set forth this relationship: "From our varied and extensive experiences with the community college since its beginning in California in 1910, there has been a distillation of general conclusions which will undoubtedly serve as guiding principles in future education developments. There is an acknowledgment that society has the responsibility for developing youth to the fullness of inherent potentiality; that such inherent capacity varies with the individual, hence what is good training for one may not be the best for another (that is, a broad plan of education must provide for the needs of diversely equipped individuals); that in a democracy the local citizens should have both a direct interest and a large responsibility for the educational and training needs at the community level; that these two general educational programs, that of the university and that of the community college, do not conflict, but actually comprise two intimately related parts of a common whole and, as such, if properly devised and administered, add strength to each; that the inclusion of local units in the higher educational plan, interrelating local and state-wide programs, should develop a broad awareness of problems and needs in education which in turn should tend to raise the average educational level."

There is no conflict, therefore, between what has been higher education in America and the new community college program. Rather there should be integration and cooperation, and together, along with our primary and secondary school systems they will contribute to the educational and social needs of American society. It is therefore pointless to characterize the community college as an upward extension of the high school or a lowering of the collegiate tradition. *A community college is itself.* As the high school was invented to provide services needful to adolescents, the community college is being created to give youth and older adults the manifold services for which they have need. The emerging public comprehensive community colleges have a unique opportunity to initiate and carry through community-centered programs of education for all age levels.

What then should be the characteristics of the curriculum programs of these new emerging institutions based on the previous outlined interpretation of their community role and educational service? That they can not be everything to everybody can be partially accepted; but that they can be much more creative and diverse at the undergraduate level than many of the present institutions of higher learning should be accepted as a basic guideline in developing their educational programs. If they are to succeed in their educational and community roles they must be comprehensive in their educational programs and not single-track institutions. They should accept students at various levels of development and academic potential and endeavor to take them from where they are academically to further identified goals. Liberal admission in its broadest interpretation, therefore, must be implemented, and as a result it creates serious implications in program planning. Without agreement on these broad principles and philosophy, the previous introductory remarks in this paper are invalid and the social and educational uniqueness of community colleges as institutions of higher learning is simply not observable or desirable.

Does this mean that comprehensive community colleges with liberal admissions policies are totally different in quality education or in the development of educational standards from older and more established senior institutions in higher education? Does this mean that by their very characteristics they are to be the so-called "waste baskets" of education? Because they have no standards of admissions, are their curriculum patterns without quality or respectability? The answer is simply *"not true."* A comprehensive pattern of education for community colleges can be designed so that quality, quantity, and diversity are in proper relation and in proper perspective. If this cannot be done, then thousands of our young people will be cut off from the main stream of a "changing America" in which education of some kind beyond high school is tantamount to survival.

The term "comprehensive community college" means many things, but most important it defines curricula and related educational and community service programs. For the next few minutes I should like to outline for you the major components of a total comprehensive program of education that many beginning community colleges should strive to establish.

College Parallel Program—Perhaps most easily defined and outlined and easily understood is the traditional program in higher education that is called Liberal Arts and Sciences, or at our college "The General Education Division." It has been my observation that this is the one program that most institutions in beginning have not had difficulty in organizing and developing. In a sense, it is a built-in program in the mind of everyone who organizes a new community college. It has an important role to play in the total program, but is only one of several major areas of concern. It should be emphasized that the community college in developing a strong two-year sequence in liberal arts should not cut the pages from someone else's catalogue. There is a unique opportunity at the community college level of education to be creative and experimental in the liberal arts and science program development.

Also included in this area of the college parallel program is the development of a quality program in basic engineering or engineering science. This two-year program, properly organized and staffed, will allow the student upon completion to transfer, in a majority of option areas, to the junior and senior years of an accredited, standard four-year engineering curriculum.

In summary, a well-defined liberal arts and science program with considerable elective courses to allow for flexibility, along with a well-defined two-year basic engineering program, are the major curricula that should be included in the college parallel area of a beginning community college.

Collegiate Technical Programs—A second major area of program development for the comprehensive community college I would entitle the Collegiate Technical Curricula. Through these programs the community college should provide students an opportunity to secure technical and sub-professional education in those areas in which business, industry, commerce, and the professions need trained technical personnel, and at the same time give to the student related work in the arts, sciences, and other subjects essential to general welfare and understanding.

In New York State, guidelines have been clearly defined by Bulletin Number 1332 in regard to technical education which are as follows:

(1) The program should be designed to prepare for existing, as well as for new occupations, which are of importance to agriculture, business, home administration, industry, and other fields, for which adequate facilities for training are not now available. Jobs in these areas are concerned with production, planning and control, supervision of work involved in operation and maintenance testing, and other activities requiring a high level of technological skill or supervisory ability.

(2) The program should be organized so that completion of the work qualifies the student for immediate occupational activity.

(3) The program of pre-employment instruction should avoid as far as possible the type of training that can be given readily and better in the employment situation.

(4) The program should offer as far as possible, preparation for closely related groups or clusters of jobs, rather than single, specific jobs.

(5) The program is primarily terminal and is not designed to prepare for study leading to a college degree. For some students, however, the institutes will open the way to more advanced education. ["Terminal" as used here, indicated preparation for immediate employment, but does not imply that education is ever ended.]

(6) Methods of teaching should be relatively direct, with a strong emphasis on doing.

(7) The curriculum should be related to local and regional needs, thereby demanding a high degree of collaboration with local groups. Certain specialized curricula, however, may be offered on a state-wide basis in designated colleges.

(8) Supplementary and pre-employment courses should be provided on a part-time basis. [Provision for evening and other courses for upgrading of employed persons should also be included.]

(9) Short intensive courses calling for the full-time attention of students should be offered to meet established needs.

Research is needed to find the local and regional community needs and thus the type of technical curricula best suited to the specific college. Along with this identification is also the necessity for understanding the financial resources available to the college for the development of programs. Not only are these programs costly in faculty resources, but also in laboratory and equipment. The initial technical curricular offerings of any beginning comprehensive community college should result from the study and research of an assigned staff of professional educators. The advice and counsel of business, professional, and industrial personnel should also be part of the process of this research.

Two principles of technical education should be basic guidelines in technical program planning: (1) The collegiate technical curriculum should answer the needs of the community and region. (2) The technical programs should never remain static.

The first principle can be adhered to by the college with close relationship to the community, beginning with the initial survey, and continuing with lay advisory committees. These should be composed of labor leaders, business managers, engineers, architects, artists, and civic-minded persons of all callings. The old town meeting approach to community problems has a full realization in the organization and application of these advisory committees. When they are incorporated into the program as they are intended, the result is a community involvement that is rewarding, both educationally and socially.

The second principle of the terminal technical curriculum offering—that of not allowing a static condition to develop—is most important. Should there ever be a time when a course is no longer justified educationally or because of technological change, the institution should be prepared to liquidate it. Just because a technical offering is started does not necessitate its continuance. Such a concept should be understood by the personnel of the institution so that they will be prepared for changes in the curricular processes. One of the greatest obstacles to curriculum change and development has been the vested interests of the staff. In many institutions, courses are maintained which no longer meet anyone's needs except those of the instructor. In such situations, the student and society are the losers. Based on the philosophy that its curriculum should meet the needs of a technological society, and a realization of its responsibilities to the student, community, industry, and the state, the institution can discharge its task effectively.

As to the organization of collegiate technical curriculums, I would recommend four major areas of consideration; they are:

(a) industry related technologies
(b) business related technologies
(c) paramedical related technologies
(d) service technologies

I believe all of these are self-explanatory by their very titles. The last, "service technologies," perhaps needs some clarification. The term 'service' in this instance means service to people, or stated in curriculum terms, programs designed to train students for technical roles that involve them in helping peoples in their sociological, psychological, and other personal need areas. With the great emphasis today on automation and its affect on people, and at the same time our concentrated effort to remove poverty from the American scene, this becomes one of the most exciting technical program areas for the community college to develop.

A third major area of program development is *Vocational Education: non-collegiate, post-secondary.*

I have included this area of program consideration for as societal problems are being identified today there is an increased concern over the secondary school drop-out and post-secondary school student who lacks training even at a minimal level for economic survival.

There is an unlimited number of occupations for which terminal training at the non-collegiate, vocational level might be provided at the community college. These curricula, distinguished from the collegiate technical area, would include many of the presently identified skill trades. They would be of different duration and scope from collegiate programs and would provide the necessary training for many post-secondary school students who cannot survive in a rigorous collegiate-level technology program.

That this is a controversial area of program consideration for the community college is acknowledged by this reporter, however, there can be no question of the answering of this educational need and every community has a responsibility in this area of education. *In this type of program planning,* the comprehensive community college moves into direct competition and duplication, so to speak, with the secondary school, especially *the area vocational secondary school* as presently being proposed in the various states.

The answer to this problem in differing communities is, in my opinion, the following: No community college in any state, whether beginning or in operation, should fail to consider this area of service now. Ideally each community should formulate a comprehensive plan (utilizing all agencies of education and government in the formulation) for occupational vocational education, assigning to each educational agency in the community that function which can be best carried out there, but covering all needs in a coordinated and efficient manner. The community college staff should play an important role in formulating this master plan.

I would recommend that if no other community agency can and will undertake the responsibility for vocational post-secondary non-collegiate education, the community college should.

If, however, there is reasonable choice, the community college might well concentrate its efforts on collegiate technical and semi-professional education (it is the agency best qualified in this area) and leave to the area vocational center or the comprehensive secondary school, if they are available, the major role in *vocational non-collegiate education.*

Continuing Education—Adult and Extension Programs—A fourth major area of program development for the comprehensive community college is the area of continuing education for the adult citizen of the community. Here again in day and evening courses, seminars, extension work, on and off campus, short courses, long courses, technical, general, liberal arts-oriented, cultural, vocational, practical, or whatever facet of need is identified, the community college should be ready to serve its community. Here again traditional barriers should be broken, for anything that is useful knowledge is worthy of teaching as long as people have need for the knowledge and demand the educational service.

American society can no longer be half informed, ill informed, or uninformed on the basic questions confronting them. In his individual life and in his co-operative life, each citizen needs the opportunity to obtain the best that education can offer. Continuing education for the adult is one means to this end, and cannot be neglected in higher education. The responsibility of institutions of higher education is not to youth of college age alone. It extends to all adults.

Not only is the role of adult education to increase the individual's sensitivity to his democratic and personal responsibilities, but also to afford him opportunities for economic betterment. The need for technological and business training is increasing with every advancement in science and adult education at the community college level can open doors for many who desire professional advancement.

The community college, because of its sociological base, is in a strategic position to provide for adult continuing education. Close to the people and their needs, servicing the educational requirements of the mass of the population, it can and should build the finest of programs. The President's Commission recognized this when they commented, "The community college must be the center for the administration of a comprehensive adult education program."

The community college is well suited to administer to the needs of adults not only because of its basic philosophy but also from a functional point of view. Previously in American education the adult program has been administered by the public primary and secondary schools due to the lack of any other institution within the community. With the new expanding community college, facilities can be planned to broaden adult education. Rather than the traditional school house design, a functional and attractive appearance should be planned. It is the belief of many who are committed to the plan of the community college that its buildings and facilities can be well adapted for adult education purposes. The problem of mixing age groups on a community college campus is furthermore less a factor in keeping adults away than it would be in a high school building. On the whole, there is considerable advantage both to the young and to the older students for this association of youth and adults.

Finally, in describing an ideal continuing education program, I would recommend that it both parallel the full-time curriculum offerings of the college and also at the same time divorce itself from all relationship to the organized curriculums in the other areas where it can and must develop educational services. At our own college in New York State we have found this area of our education program to be the most extensive and rapidly growing of all of our education services. The student population alone attests to this in every community college that has a continuing education program. Also it is this public that is the agent for the community college's success or failure in a given community. It is this public when well serviced who will defend the community college and be ready to assist the institution in any given situation. They are already the voters and they know what they want.

Co-curricular Services—Along with these four major areas of program development there is a fifth major area that is not developed through courses or curriculum programs. This program is educational in nature and equally important to the other three, is often called the co-curricular program of a college. A community college, even at its beginning, cannot afford to neglect this area of educational service. What is this area? It is all of the well known things that make up a college such as student government, lecture series, special events, club activity, athletics, student publications, etc. Too often they are not found on community college campuses; too often they are done with less than quality in mind and more often than not, poorly financed. A community college perhaps more than any other type of institution of higher education needs a meaningful, well directed educational program in co-curricular activities.

Today with the complex problems of our society, co-curricular activities carry a serious and educational tone and also personal involvement characteristics for students and faculty. With this philosophy being implemented the co-curricular program becomes one of the finest educational vehicles for student learning in the total comprehensive program of community college education. Co-curricular activities, properly directed, become educational community services programs. Using my own college as an example, it has been through our co-curricular programs that many of our most meaningful educational experiences have been provided for our students. Community projects, field trips, early horizon programs for under-privileged children, involvement in community elections, outstanding lecture series, technical lecturers, and on-the-job observations, to name a few, have all been part of this program.

Basically, these men are the major components of a comprehensive educational program for a typical public community college. College parallel, collegiate technical, vocational, post high school, non-collegiate continuing education—evening and extension, and a broad spectrum of co-curricular activities and community service programs all contribute in placing before a non-selective student body many opportunities for participation and organized educational experiences. Though each community college will be responsive and dependent on its own geographic and sociological setting, each should develop the components of such a total program towards goals of increased service, quality, and effective and diverse educational experiences.

Before closing my remarks regarding the total curriculum program of a community college, I would like to emphasize the important role of student personnel services in achieving effective results in implementing the educational program.

The Student Personnel Program—The student personnel program of the new community college is of primary importance. The statement that "all education is guidance" applies to the community college, and the need for an organized student personnel program is essential. If the community college recognized the fact of individual differences and attempts to do something about it, this recognition will demand an organized and well-financed program of personnel service.

A common criticism of so-called efficient personnel programs in many of our larger universities and colleges is that they have become too centralized. In these programs it is assumed that only the experts in guidance are qualified to administer to student needs. An alert faculty who know these needs are often left without a guidance role. Another problem is that an administrator often finds it impossible to decentralize his student personnel program because of insufficient interest and training of his faculty.

It is recommended, therefore, that the new community colleges have the following policies in order to solve these problems:

(1) The guidance program should be decentralized in organization.
(2) There should be an effective program of in-service training dealing with the guidance roles for the faculty.

The policy of decentralization needs clarification. It does not imply that a well-organized, trained staff of guidance experts is not required. Due to the comprehensive nature of the community college curriculum, it is necessary to administer specialized measurement tests which need a staff of experts. Further, this staff has a role of leadership in developing integration and decentralization. They are the resource group to whom the individual faculty member will turn for help on difficult guidance problems.

The decentralized program, therefore, will have an organization based on a central guidance staff, responsible for specialized testing, measurement and resource. Co-operating with this staff are the faculty members who would share the responsibility of counseling and varied student personnel services. In the role of counselor, these faculty members will facilitate the solving of students' personal problems and, at the same time, achieve coordination in the institute program by stressing the essential interrelatedness of technical and general education.

In furthering this function, the faculty can continually assemble facts regarding the requirements of all types of vocations, occupational trends and shifts, wage scales, conditions surrounding work, means of securing employment, retraining and upgrading, and similar types of information.

The success of the decentralized guidance program will depend upon the community college's policies of employment and in-service training of faculty. The administration should consider carefully the guidance training of the prospective faculty member. Following employment, his introduction to the student personnel program should be a co-operative function of administration, faculty, and guidance staff.

With these principles of decentralization and in-service training in mind, specialized services of the guidance program should be considered. The first of these is job analysis. The community colleges as planned in New York State provide for a complete study of the employment requirements in their specific area of operation. Lengthy surveys, studies, and reports were used and continue to be used for planning and building the technical curriculum. However, this is not sufficient to solve this important problem. Due to the community relationship of the community college and its sociological base, the entire college personnel must be included in a program of job analysis. It cannot be left to the department head, the curriculum committee, or outside experts. Techniques will have to be found whereby the individual teacher will play a large role in job analysis. The effectiveness of the technical curriculum will depend on the interrelatedness of instructor and student and the job. Each faculty member must find a way to establish close relationship with business and industry, a relationship that is both personal and professional.

Another major role of the student personnel program for the community college is the establishment of a follow-up program. Much has been said and written about follow-up in every area of American education—high school through college. That it remains today still as a matter of secondary importance in the majority of guidance programs is both tragic and shortsighted. Since the community college is increasingly concerned about its students' training for job placement and success in their jobs after graduation, job placement is of primary importance. Education and job placement certainly do not end when the words "you are a graduate" have been spoken.

The essentials of a satisfactory counseling program for the community college, therefore, should include:

(1) Recognizing the characteristics of the counseling program of the two-year community college.
(2) Reasonable counseling setup and assignments.
(3) Sufficient physical equipment and utilization.
(4) Full use of counseling procedures and techniques.
(5) Proper training of counseling staff, both pre-service and in-service.
(6) Co-ordination with the entire faculty of the community college.
(7) Co-operation with all community services.
(8) Acquisition of occupational information.
(9) Articulation with higher and lower school units.
(10) Adequate follow-up and placement service.

Further clarification and enlargement of these criteria is not within the scope of this report. It is important, however, to establish them as guiding policies for the new community college program, and their achievement would contribute to a successful student personnel program.

This, then, is a brief overview of some of the recognized service areas of the community college educational program. That these outlined curriculum patterns are the *only ones* for this new college is to place the speaker in a position of an educational expert which he is not. They are, however, diverse yet mutually supportive concepts and if well implemented can provide the kind of educational experiences that in the long run will contribute to the general advancement of our society.

One last recommendation that needs special emphasis for community college education: No community or state should ever attempt to build a public two-year college or colleges with less than quality education in mind. Community college education is not to be viewed simply as a cheap way to educate second class citizens. Whether it is measured by faculty salaries, buildings, equipment, or service functions, there is no inexpensive way to provide the kind of program previously described in this report.

Simply stated, "if it is to be done at all, it must be done well." If this is not the philosophy of the community or the state the results will be less than satisfactory.

I would close by quoting from the catalogue of the college I represent. "As a community college, Dutchess belongs to the citizens who support it and are served by it; its philosophy properly reflects a response to their collective and individual needs. Aware of the complexity and variety of challenges facing the members of a highly industrialized and increasingly urbanized democratic society, the trustees, administration, and faculty have committed the college to an educational program featuring quality, opportunity, diversity, and social responsibility." And also "Dutchess Community College represents a tacit acceptance by the people of the County and the State, of the obligation of a democratic society to provide its members an everwidening and upward-spiraling range of opportunities for self-realization. In preparing its graduates as well-informed citizens, as skilled workers, and as sensitive and responsible human beings, Dutchess Community College aims to contribute to the building of a better nation and a better world."

As a final guideline to all community college planners, the last word comes from Dr. Conant: "no school I know of has any one purpose. Schools are multi-purpose. Educational experiences are like threads woven in a fabric; to attempt to judge them in isolation is to falsify the picture."

TEACHERS
for the Community College

John A. Stoops

America appears benumbed by its exploding educational enterprise. Many responsible professionals and a few concerned laymen are beginning to display the morphia characteristic of battle hardened campaigners who have already seen more than they ever expected to see and done more than they ever expected to do. They respond methodically to new problems. The bands, banners, and other hallmarks of heroic achievement are often disregarded.

Recently a school superintendent told me his district had no intention of holding a dedication service for the latest of a long series of new buildings. Said he, "We don't do that any more, our friends are tired of coming, and it only riles the opposition." All of this simply implies that we are in a decisive period in the history of education, a time when great deeds are so commonplace they are heralded only by cryptic announcements.

We know that great work is being done, and I dare phrase our common hope that posterity's view of our effort will be favorable.

Modern philosophy and the recently recognized social science disciplines are deeply interested in something called the social consensus. There is a fascinated concern in how the public decides what it decides, that mysterious, often tumultuous process by which society knows what it wants, separates good from bad, and selects the institutions or agencies to execute its will. It is impossible to fix with certainty the exact moment when the social consensus is achieved, but we have grown adept at reading its signals. When elements of method appear in the midst of ferment, there is good reason to think the public will is set and the institutional order has begun a response.

The public problem on which we have the most recent public verdict stems from a serious deficiency among the array of institutional prototypes called American higher education. This deficiency became very apparent in the years immediately subsequent to the second world war. It became obvious the full humane and technical potential of this era could not be realized unless there came a new institution or a drastic adaptation of an existing model. The need was for a higher institution capable of rapid expansion, comprehensive in program, non-selective, and nearly tuition free. The need also was for an institution identified with and capable of giving strength to American communities. Its philosophical orientations needed to be toward the problem-centered pluralism by which communities organize themselves and establish their values. It needed to be primarily a teaching institution which accepts community service as its major purpose rather than a sanctuary for professional scholarship which views community service as collateral.

We can reserve to later scholarship the judgment whether the American community college is a new institution or a modification of an earlier prototype. The focus of this forum is upon the fact that the American community college is receiving the public summons to appear. It would be splendid if we could know how many institutions of this kind will appear in the next twenty years. In 1860 the American public high school was a new idea. By 1915 nearly every American community had one or was in the process of forming one. This fifty-five year development must be viewed as spectacular on the scale by which previous educational developments were paced. However, it is commonly agreed that the rate of transformation in our times makes those Victorian cadences seem leisurely, and the accomplishments of that half century could very well be matched by the community college in two decades of its prospective motivity.

This is why I am not inclined to set great store by any estimates of the numbers of teachers and administrators needed. It is impossible to know how sharply the curve will climb; such numbers as have been projected are of academic interest only. I am satisfied to think that any level of effort we can summon shall leave us short of teachers. The flood is coming upon us and it would be absurd to wait for the water to deepen before deciding how and when to control its flow. Let us then accept as transcending the welter and raw of change the massive fact that great numbers of teachers and administrators will be needed; and move immediately to an examination of their characteristics, their source and the manner of their training.

Analysis of the characteristics of the community college teacher departs from analysis of the characteristics of the community college. *If* we are clear on what the institution *is* and what it *does* we have a useful means of knowing the qualities of those who teach its *students* and administer its *programs.*

The Faculty Judges its Own Competence. We have said that it is an institution of higher education. There are many types of institutions which hold membership in this category. Of all of the generalities observers would propose, one, at least, can stand uncontested. The faculty of an institution of higher education is the judge of its own competence. This merely affirms a tradition which has stood in western education since the thirteenth century and stands as the principal distinction between higher and basic education. In elementary and secondary education in the United States and in most other nations the state becomes a party to the question of competence, usually via licensure or certification. But higher education is the bastion of tough-minded scholarship wherein the academic community rejects external control because only through complete freedom can it exercise its ultimate and self-imposed responsibility to examine itself.

Thus, if community colleges are to be higher institutions, the traditions of self-examination and self-criticism so vital to the academic profession must be conspicuously developed. More than this, it must be better understood. Academic freedom is not merely a privilege (as so many professors seem to feel). It is a necessary condition for the academic profession to conduct its own self-examination. I find it distressing to witness professors using academic freedom as a sanctuary for hortative public pronouncements on subjects very remote from their scholarly interests or competence.

However its occasional abuse, it is imperative to higher education that an atmosphere for self-examination prevail. The teacher, therefore, must be capable of the feat of abstraction, be committed to values which transcend the hour, be reverent of the pursuit of truth, and be disciplined to the appropriate applications of freedom to the governance of academic standards. If a community college is to command the respect of the academic profession these qualities must be reflected in its affairs. This is only possible if the qualities are strongly invested in the teachers. I submit, the destiny of the American community college may very well hinge on this point. Control of competence must come from internal examination and development and not by external policies devised and applied from places far and remote from where the college does its living and breathing.

The Faculty is Diversified: A second major consideration is the comprehensive nature of the community college. Throughout the history of American education the public seems to have displayed a preference that public institutions be comprehensive in character.

The issue of shoes versus philosophy confronts nearly every institution. As you might expect it is the theme of many lively discussions on this campus. In western Europe, until very recently, the prevailing multiple track programs separated the technical studies from the humane through separate institutions. Early in this century the academic profession forced this same kind of division upon the secondary schools. Thus, vocational high schools were one thing, and academic high schools were supposed to be another.

The American public was not entirely happy with the separation then, and there is considerable evidence that the passing of fifty years has not won its approval. Perhaps the single track ideology is more consistent with our notions about democracy. Efforts to promote the two-track system here seem always to face uphill despite the strange but persistent tradition of favorable federal legislation for vocational schools. Now, the single track is finding increasing popularity in Europe. Whatever else it may do to the harmony and homogenetity of our institutional life, the American public seems to want the study of shoes and philosophy together in its public institutions.

This single track ideology is clearly reflected in the community college. Its faculty, therefore, will include a great many different kinds of people. The academic profession must discover and accept the fact that some of the most valuable teachers in the community colleges, those in charge of technical specialties or occupational courses, may not have academic degrees and should not be pressured into getting them.

If a man is to teach students to operate business machines the obvious question is does he teach students to operate business machines. If he has a degree, certainly no one will object to it. Should he get a degree? I suppose all of us would like that. It may not improve his capacity to teach business machine operation, but we could be grateful for any enlargements in his view or spirit which may result.

But this may not be what he should do, and I suggest the profession would be wrong either to force him, or even more wrong to contrive a degree for him without giving this field time to develop a method, a content, and a spirit. I suppose this is a little like asking mountain climbers to declare that mountains are not important. It has been observed that self-interest is that wonderful instrument whereby we put out our own eyes. We who have been up one kind of mountain must lay aside self-interest to keep our eyes open to the fact that other men have climbed other kinds of mountains, and we can hail their achievements as sweetly as we applaud our own.

The Faculty Encounter A Greater Ability Range: A third factor which influences the nature of the community college teacher is the non-selective nature of its admissions. There will be many good students in community colleges. Perhaps a majority of them would be welcome in the first two years of most four-year colleges. But the fact stands that there will also be a number who are classified in that unjust and irrational category called: "not college material." It is grievous, indeed, to hear earnest students of respectable purpose who very obviously are something to themselves and something to their communities described as not being something else. Such descriptions reflect poverty of both language and manners. They also imply a clairvoyance which no one has.

However, teachers in community colleges *will* encounter a wider range of student abilities than their counterparts in the four-year institution. Indeed, they will encounter it to a greater degree than in most high schools where homogeneous grouping is a long tradition. Assuredly, this presents a greater didactical challenge.

Very obviously, the community college teacher would be better for having some training in the didactical problems which will confront him. So, for that matter, would some of the teachers in four-year colleges where it is frequently reported that pedagogical distinction falls short of being a universal quality. In a discussion about community college teachers one knowing observer remarked that they should have the same qualifications as those of our present teachers of college freshmen, and another knowing observer replied, "God forbid."

The Faculty Relate to a Community: The community college is also part of a community in a way that most existing four-year institutions are not and probably have no wish to be. It is true that nearly every college has its community service program. Adult courses, public lectures, library privileges, and athletic admissions help counteract the "town-gown" difficulties which result from having professors roaming at large in the neighborhood churches and public schools.

But the community college is involved in a different way. Community service is not its side line, but part of its central purpose. The community college is not only interested in the intelligencia of the town. It caters as well to the educational interests of tradesmen, technicians, shopkeepers, and salesmen.

It is not on the fringes of the town; it is in the heart of the town, and the town-gown problem should not be severe. A community college teacher has a responsibility to the community that his counterpart in the four-year institution would be reluctant to assume. He must, therefore, have some capacity for sociological and political analysis. He must have a capacity to understand his community. A professor out of contact with the actualities of community life can be a thorn in the flesh of a four-year college president, but he would be a bone in the throat of a community college president.

The community college is primarily a teaching and not a research institution. Doctorate degrees need not be the paradigm of scholarly achievement for the community college teacher. He will be a teacher. Good master degree programs will generally suffice for his subject matter preparation. In a recent analysis Blocker[1] reports that there are fewer differences between the characteristics of the community college faculties and university faculties than ordinarily surmised. He notes with some approval the fact that the proportion of master degrees is somewhat higher and the proportion of doctorates somewhat lower in the community college. But he found no empirical evidence that community college teachers were not as fully degreed as their university counterparts who were in actual contact with students. If a community college teacher must do research to the point of not being a full-time teacher, he should attempt to persuade a four-year or graduate level institution to take interest in his services.

Where are these teachers now? Some of them are in undergraduate programs only vaguely aware of the career opportunities in college teaching. In the next few years some of these will encounter publicity put out by the few universities which are deployed to help colleges find teachers, and they will enter appropriate graduate training. Others are still students in high school only now beginning to show the qualities of mind and spirit which mark them for success as teachers. But these same qualities usually make success in other fields, and such students are already beckoned by attractions so alluringly displayed by those enterprises which have learned how vital it is to have the very best talent.

Others are now *teaching* in high schools. Indeed some very good prospects are there. But those of us who have been students of secondary education hope that higher education will not nourish itself greatly from this source. Secondary education has its own modes and models. Its validity is separate and independent. If a very large proportion of college teachers come from this source, the characteristics of the high school may become characteristic of the college. Secondary education also has a serious problem of teacher supply. Additional loss of some of its best teachers would deprive it of leadership that is already wanting. It is patently unwise to belabor a source already plagued by insufficiency.

A cursory glance along the whole vertical continuum of American education reveals no point which can stand indifferent to the loss of some of its best teachers. But the danger of recruiting elsewhere on the continuum is greatest to the community college itself. Students of the community college movement would do well to contemplate the melancholy example of the American junior high school. Here was a bustling new idea which emerged in institutional form full of potence and promise early in the twentieth century. It seems to have lost its potence and has never filled its promise. I think the reason is that teachers were never trained to implement its rationale and spirit even though the values remain unchallenged to this hour. This example adds cogency to the appeal that higher education develop additional sources of teacher supply.

---

[1] *Clyde Blocker, "Are our Faculties Competent,"* Junior College Journal, *Vol. 36 No. 4 (December 1965), P. 12.*

A very significant group of prospects is not now in school either as students or teachers. I refer to an untapped legion of men and women currently at work in mines, shops, factories, and fields, and in offices of medicine, charity, business and law. They are in countless places, each of them acquiring for himself one skill of the vast multitude of technologies upon which modern communities depend. Some are only starting this work; others have been in it for sufficient years to establish a moderate retirement income. Most of these prospects have degrees, but a few do not. This should not lessen our interest in them.

Which of the many will teach? Which can teach? How will they be recruited? What training do they need? Where and how shall it be done? All of these questions are new and different. These problems have received some attention. Four areas of concern have clearly emerged:

(1) *The College Parallel Program:* The college parallel program includes courses in the liberal arts and sciences. These courses are of major interest to about half of the students in community colleges. They are also supporting courses for certain of the technical, business, and occupational programs. Such teachers must have academic qualifications equal to their colleagues in four-year institutions and didactical skills which, if anything, exceed those of the four-year college teacher.

In addition to this, the community college teacher should recognize something of the historical foundations of higher education with particular reference to the development of his own institution, and he should acquire understanding of the political and sociological foundations of the American community. Such a background seems imperative if community college faculty is intelligibly to discern the full purpose of their teaching and if they are to help keep the community college attuned to its mission.

Merson and Harris made a survey of the training programs of universities mainly in the Mid-West, West, and South. Wide variations were found.[2]

The *juste milieu* of current practice is difficult to locate or define; but, taken in balance, most programs include external visibility, recruitment and screening, an M.A. or M.S. in the field, didactics, seminars on the nature of higher education, and internships of one or two semesters at full or part salary. These components are mixed in various ways. Some lead to special degrees or university credentials; others do not. Although such programs are primed to serve the two-year colleges, there is equal claim to their applicability for similar assignment in any institution of higher education.

---

[2] *Norman C. Harris and Thomas B. Merson,* Preparation of Junior College Instructors—Part II Programs of Junior College Teacher Education in Selected Colleges and Universities *(A mimeographed document) Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, September 1963.*

(2) *The Collegiate Technical Programs:* Most community colleges will train engineering and industrial technicians in terminal programs. Depending on local circumstances, it can be expected that a significant portion of the students of a community college will have major interest in a technical specialty. Civil, electrical, chemical, mechanical technicians are but a few standards among the many varieties required by American business and industry. Many technical specialties which will be taught in the community colleges of a decade hence do not now exist.

For these teachers, the question of a degree program is premature and not presently relevant. The first concerns must be for the content of each specialty, its curricular organization, and the effective modes and methods of its exposition. As these elements form and merge into a didactic it will ultimately become possible to establish a teacher training program leading to a degree.

The fact that our colleagues in the Middle and Far West have made beginnings in this direction should urge us in our own initiative. I am indebted to Dean Meder for elements of the suggestion which I now propose as a generative policy for this area. Universities with a traditional interest in technology and with standing business and industrial connections could sponsor a series of institutes which include persons from industry, the colleges of engineering, successful community college teachers of technical specialities, authorities on technical curricula and specialists in teaching methodology. The purposes of such institutes being the determination of course content, its organization for teaching, and the development of the arts of its presentation. I submit cooperative institutes such as these could help universities to establish the basis of full training programs leading ultimately to degrees for teachers of technical specialties in community colleges. As new specialties appear, as established specialties undergo modification, the institutes could continue to perform the threefold functions of identifying, structuring, and professing the new content.

This generative policy of cooperative institutes should work as well for the emerging para-medical technologies and for a number of the advanced business technologies such as those growing out of the unprecedented developments in processing and analysis of data. Taken together, all will present a fascinating new study for those interested in the phenomena of curriculum and teaching.

(3) *The Occupational and Recreational Programs:* Clearly, the community college is destined to minister to the leisure time inclinations and certain the vocational aspirations of the public it serves. Such programs may or may not be two years in length. Many will be offered in evenings. Their purpose is to teach salable skills or provide for expanding interests. The range

of interest areas can extend literally from A to Z. The occupational training will provide superior clerical workers, general maintenance men, and artisans of many kinds.

Teachers for these courses and programs must, therefore, be a diversified group. Some will have Ph.D.'s, some will be lawyers, physicians, and engineers. Some may have no degree but will hold undisputed authority in their specialty. The characteristics of this group will differ from college to college and from year to year.

The best institution to prepare this kind of teacher is perhaps the Community College itself. Many times such courses will have genesis in the knowledge that a teacher is available with the strength to attract and hold an enrollment. There is no reason why the community college could not develop its own training program, if such training is needed, and make the expense of the training program part of the expense of providing the service. If a teacher of a recreational or occupational course is full time, and committed to a career as a professional teacher, a sympathetic college administration can also arrange for part-time study at a college or university. Obviously, if the teacher has no degree some activity on his part will be required to achieve promotion. Some can matriculate for a degree; others can, and probably should, demonstrate their development in other ways.

Although it seems feasible for a community college to develop some of its own teachers caution must be invoked against excessive levels of self-training. The dangers of in-breeding are well-known to the academic profession and particularly known by its accrediting bodies. Therefore, any application of this method must be undertaken with circumspection.

(4) *Administrators and Service Personnel:* The supply of trained administrators is somewhat outside the scope of this paper but very much a concern of the community college. More universities must join the effort. The Junior College Leadership Program, sponsored by the Kellogg Foundation, now provides fellowships at ten universities. Other universities in the South and West are making extensive efforts to meet the need. But the demand for presidents, registrars, deans, bursars, accountants, business managers, and numerous counselors far exceeds the present meager supply. Outside of the State of New York there is no significant effort in the Middle States area to develop an available supply of administrative and service personnel.

Most of the present training programs for top-level community college administrators terminate with the doctorate. There appears to be no question that this is wise. But doctorate programs are expensive for both student and university. If universities are to accelerate the pace of their doctorate programs the problem of funding must have a solution.

The most vital characteristics of the community college teacher are to be found in the set of attitudes he brings to the act of teaching. These, I think, are personal and are only to a very limited degree subject to modification by training. Teaching is unlike any other work which men do. Teachers provide the link between the here-to-fore and the hereafter, and in moments of inspiration, to the everlasting. Teaching does not permit a high level of egoism. It is a moral imperative that a teacher care about others; he must want to give. In this sense teachers are Promethian humanists; and, like Prometheus, they must be willing to suffer chains in order to liberate others into new levels of thought and feeling.

Other forms of work permit external loyalties. Other professions can give prime loyalty to their brotherhoods. But an authentic teacher can not. Each must first be loyal to the truth that appears in his own lights and second to the students who come before him to hear that truth. This often makes him difficult of organization and almost impossible of management. But it is the only thing which makes him a teacher and not something else.

As we, in the Middle States mount this great advance of a new institution, dedicated to great teaching, perhaps it would be well for us to review carefully the venerated traditions which make teaching the thing that it is. Increasingly, we find teachers at the elementary and secondary level are beckoned away from those traditions to give first loyalty to similar unions or similar welfare groups. It is with distress that I note that teaching in some areas of our nation is being separated from its *a priori* foundations. This is not a fault of teachers alone. It is also fault in a system which strives to maintain that teachers are all alike and which submerges their individuality in vast establishments and of a society which has found no way appropriately to recognize those who do achieve distinction. There is also fault in those of us who select, train, and lead. So often we fail to find or to kindle the Promethian flame.

With an increasing proportion of the American teaching profession marching under a banner marked "self-concern," I suggest the search for community college teachers be directed particularly toward those with a larger than life commitment. We know them; we have always known them, but we have grown so comfortable with empirical indices of talent that we frequently note pride reflected in policies that look at test scores instead of looking at men.

Thus, the problem of finding teachers for community colleges is also a remarkable opportunity. For if the academic leadership in American communities is in the Promethian tradition, and if the colleges of, by, and for those communities establish conditions under which that tradition is maintained and fostered, it may be possible to stem a tide and possible to keep our civilization in a state of ascendency.

PANEL DISCUSSION

CHARLES W. GUDITUS, *Presiding*

Participants: Dr. Louis Bender; Dr. Leonard Wolf; Dr. Charles Rollins; Dr. H. D. Reese.

DR. LOUIS BENDER: There are five points that I would raise in relation to the presentation by Dr. Stoops.

The first point relates to Dr. Stoops' mention of the social consensus. Dr. Reese and I just returned from a conference of state directors, and one of the things which was very prominently discussed was the emergence throughout the United States of a societal mandate for public two-year higher education. There wasn't a single report from these directors representing forty states and Canada that didn't reflect legislative development and direct effort toward establishing such institutions. The receptivity on the part of the constituency was equally consistent.

This social consensus will, to some extent resolve some of the problems of recruitment of the teaching staff; because, whether we like it or not, we have working to our advantage the "social snobbery" of our society. There is status in teaching at the collegiate level and this status will in fact be a prominent factor in attracting teachers.

The second point relates to one made by Dr. Hall when he spoke of the community college as the action agent for the community.

The community college president and his staff must consistently strive to eliminate the artificial dichotomy that exists between those aspects of curricula that are generally referred to as the academic program and the vocational technical program. The community college will be seriously handicapped in its mission as action agent if it proves to be incapable of minimizing status differentiation between the various components of its instructional program.

The third point is really a point related to me by Dr. Bonnell some time ago. We were talking as the Council of Community College Presidents of the Commonwealth. Dr. Bonnell stated that he would like to voice an objection to the classification of training programs that would be "community college training programs." Dr. Bonnell's point is that the community college teacher is a teacher in higher education, just as Dean Meder pointed out today when he spoke about the four-year liberal arts college as having teaching as one of the prominent sides of its triangle, or square or circle. So there must be training of people who are concerned about their disciplines. But training must also focus upon the important ingredient in the process, the student. The student is as important to the four-year institution as to the community college. Therefore, he would suggest not to have such a label.

I would agree with him one hundred per cent on the philosophic base, and I would also agree with him on a practical base. Community college education is related to higher education and it carries the kind of mandate about which Dr. Stoops spoke. The faculty will administer its own program and will maintain its own standards. What I am saying is that community college education is not related to certification or to all the other super-structures that go with basic education, and we hope it never will be so related. It is important that we guard against that and against any naming of programs. This is not only detrimental in terms of the status symbol that I spoke of earlier, but also encourages possible efforts to establish certification programs.

The fourth point I would like to make is this. Universities have a goal that goes beyond the teaching of teachers. Here in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania we have ordained that community education will be established in those communities where there is appropriate initiative and the kind of ability to serve and support a truly comprehensive program. Our universities have a responsibility to assist these communities to assess the opportunity that is made available to their constituents through this or other institutional arrangements. The universities will fail desperately to fulfill this major responsibility if they operate as obstructionists to, rather than motivators for, the provision for additional educational opportunities.

The fifth and final point is for the consideration of community college trustees that are here. It deals with the question of recruiting staff for our community colleges. It is absolutely correct that the new institutions presently enjoy a fantastic experience in recruiting teachers. In Philadelphia there were eight hundred applicants and in Bucks County there were nearly three hundred applications for only twenty-two teaching positions. This experience has been repeated over and over. However, I suggest that there are four fundamental ingredients which now exist that may not continue to exist. One is the excitement and opportunity that goes with these new institutions. A second is the fact that many people see in the community college movement in Pennsylvania a tremendous challenge, and they are responding to this challenge. The third is the love of teaching and the desire of some teachers to get into the classroom where they work intimately with students. The fourth is that the community colleges have developed in their plans attractions for quality teachers by providing attractive salary schedules.

I suggest that when the community colleges do not provide a climate for their instructional staff to learn, to grow, and to develop through provision for continuous contact with the academic and technical community and do not maintain salary schedules that will permit and encourage instructional staff to do these kinds of things, these institutions will begin to fail.

DR. LEONARD WOLF: Because I agree with so much of what Professor Stoops had to say and so much approve of his manner of saying it, I fear that further comment might be superfluous. However, I will risk being superfluous and invite further discussion of the qualifications of these men and women upon whom the success of the community college depends.

Of extreme importance is the commitment to scholarship and the dedication to learning. If, after all, we seek quality as well as diversity in the community college then these matters are highly significant. It is important to note that this must include those working in the practical or occupational aspects of the community college program. Their dedication and commitment must be on the basis of knowledge and skill acquired by recent and in many cases prolonged practical experience. This gives us one of the things Dr. Hall referred to in his masterly presentation of the program of a community college. I, therefore, endorse Dr. Stoops' substitution of experience for degrees for these types of teachers.

I also agree with the idea that community college teachers must understand the nature, purpose, and philosophy of the community college with special reference to the democratizing forces involved. I subscribe also to the point that we can improve the status of any man in society through education as long as he is motivated to learn. I agree that the community college teacher must understand political, social, and economical issues, especially those closely related to the life of his community. This understanding must be part of his essence.

Finally, I think the community college teacher must be fully committed to the personal development of his students through guidance and sympathetic personal direction. This, too, is a highly significant quality in the kind of teacher we want. We are not describing ideal qualifications. We know that a teacher can not be all of these things in the extreme, but some elements of each of these qualities, to some slight degree at the very least, will be needed to give us successful teachers.

In conclusion I want to emphasize that even qualified teachers such as those just described can not become successful in a community college unless there is established a faculty-administration relationship which permits these two aspects of the college to work together for the continued development of the students and the community.

DR. CHARLES ROLLINS: I would appreciate help from some of our sister institutions which have so much more experience, greater traditions, and obviously more wisdom. They can aid the community college in its search for staff people who are aware of problems that face community college instructors. We need young people and older people, and we need women as well as men, but they all must understand what "diversity of student ability" really means.

We are faced with many kinds of ability in numerous areas. Community colleges need a particular kind of person who recognizes the worth of all students whether they are in engineering, in data processing, in secretarial or in one of the many other areas of the program. I am concerned that those agencies which help us secure teachers make a special effort to find people who appreciate this kind of diversity of interest and ability. Our teachers must also be in sympathy with the philosophy of successive opportunity which is a more appropriate way of describing our concern for those sometimes called "retreads" and also our concern for the person who has had academic difficulty in another institution. Our whole fabric as a nation is based to a great extent on our belief in providing successive opportunities to succeed or fail. Many times we find teachers traditionally oriented to a traditional school, who, themselves, were taught in a very traditional fashion, are somewhat apprehensive about certain implications of this philosophy of successive opportunity.

The community college teacher must be aware that proximity to the community is sometimes wonderful and sometimes less than wonderful. In terms of public reaction he must be aware that he represents a college that is very close to a community. Bucks County Community College is right in the midst of the community, so there are letters to the editor, numerous phone calls to the president, occasional phone calls to the teachers, visits by irate parents, and many other things with which other types of colleges are not faced. The program which teaches community college teachers must prepare them for this.

Currently, instructors in community colleges are the "low men on the totem pole" of the educational hierarchy. Often people say to a young teacher who aspires to begin his teaching in an institution where teaching is very important, "Why are you going there?" "Why don't you go to a regular college?" This is also a problem which all of us must face and for which we must prepare our young teachers. I think we must also rely on you to turn out the kind of young teachers who know what the guidance function really means in terms of availability of instructor to students. The gap between student and teacher must be bridged so that we do not have strangers meeting each other in the classroom.

Probably the greatest problem that one faces with a new faculty in a new community college is that of stressing standards in all fields. People ask me, "Do you mean to say that the standards in a course in computer technology are as stringent as those in a course in liberal arts?" I recently ran across a statement by John Gardner which I think is relevant. He said that an excellent plumber is infinitely more admirable than an incompetent philosopher. A society which scorns excellence because plumbing is a humble activity and tolerates shoddiness in philosophy because philosophy is an exalted activity will have neither good plumbing nor good philosophy. "Neither its pipes nor its theories will hold water."

Communicating this point of view to community college teachers and communicating it through the teachers to the community itself is a very real problem for the community college. We look to our sister institutions to help us by providing excellent teachers who are aware of what a community college is, what it is striving to do, and how it fits into the community.

DR. H. D. REESE: I approach this topic as a practitioner. It has been my job for the past ten years in the State of Maryland to work with the community college presidents, and before them the superintendents of schools in the counties in which these institutions began. I have helped in the development of adequate programs, the employment of competent presidents, and provision of the machinery for enabling those presidents to surround themselves with competent faculty. Over the years, working with these people, there have been decisions which had to be made at my desk as to whether or not a person is competent to teach in one of our public community colleges in Maryland.

We have actually written into our procedures a statement meant to reassure those concerned about whether or not we are going to have certification requirements for community college teachers. The State Department of Education in Maryland does not foresee the establishment of certification standards for teachers in the community colleges. We recognize that the community colleges, by being colleges, will have programs which are leading to additional work in four year colleges and universities. Consequently, we have written our faculty standards in such fashion that those courses taught in community colleges would be most likely to be accepted for transfer to most colleges or universities.

We say that community college teachers should have the same degree of competence required of people to teach in any other college or university, and we can't use the term master's degree because we find some who enrolled in Johns Hopkins and proceeded beyond the master's degree level without actually taking the master's degree. So if we use such terms, we must refer to the master's degree, or higher, to teach the transfer subjects in the community college. Unless we do, we are "strait-jacketing" ourselves. We try to think of having preparation at the graduate level in the field of work in which the person is teaching. Here again there are some who say, "What quantitative measures do you use?" We respond by indicating our adherence to the Middle States standards which are qualitative and not quantitative.

It's true that we have problems in the occupational curricula. We state in our standards that the person should have the equivalent of the master's degree. This raises the matter of interpretation and questions about possible approaches. I just do not know how you can evaluate those who are teaching occupational courses, but I believe that we can approach the qualification to teach that particular area with a different point of view. We can use competency to teach and experience in a particular area as perhaps of greater significance than the number of semester hours or the number of degrees.

It behooves the president of the community college to become more than just a public relations man. And this applies particularly during the initial stages of a developing institution. We expect the president to be administrator; guidance counselor; and, particularly, dean of instruction. In Maryland we expect the president to supervise instruction. We expect him to be reasonable and not to infringe upon the academic freedom of the teachers. Somebody in the institution must come before public groups and speak with authority as to the teaching competence of the faculty. I make it a practice each year to visit many of the classes of the community colleges so that I can speak with some degree of authority to public groups about what takes place there.

I think it would be well for some of our universities to plan programs (and I go along with Dr. Bender on this) which, instead of being programs for the preparation of community college teachers alone, would be programs to prepare college teachers. This would help provide a supply of teachers for employment not just in community colleges. We have the same need in four-year colleges, and I dare say that those of us who are here from universities would agree that areas exist there which could be improved.

I would say, Dr. Stoops, that rather than having a teacher education program which would become a part of the program of the community college that this should be the function of colleges and universities that have graduate level work. I am old-fashioned enough to believe that people who are teaching in all types of colleges ought to have at least a baccalaureate degree. If certain people with baccalaureate degrees are inadequate, I would then raise the question about having some kind of program in the community college to prepare them. This is not to preclude the possibility of having in-service programs for all teachers within the community college.

If we constantly stress the need for supervision of instruction in the community colleges (as well as four-year colleges), it should help a great deal, even after the faculty has been developed to the point of having heads of departments. Supervision should first of all be a responsibility of the president. He may pass this on to the dean of instruction who ultimately may share this duty with heads of departments. Although no longer directly involved, the president still maintains supervision of instruction, and this well may include visitation of classes. I think there is nothing sacred about the college classroom. If a teacher is shaky about being visited by one of his peers, he had better do a little more preparation.

Dr. Stoops, I'd like to take partial exception to something you said. (Maybe I misunderstood you.) You said that a higher education faculty, and I presume you included the community college, should be the judge of its own competence. There may come a time when a college faculty could be considered as a competent judge of itself, but I believe that there ought to be some agency in the state that ought to be the first level of approval or accreditation which is then to be followed by a regional accreditation before it is appropriate to think of a faculty having such competence.

DR. HALL: I just want to make one remark about faculty that I think will be interesting to board members of new community colleges, and perhaps to the presidents here from the states of Delaware, New Jersey, and Pennsylvania. The most difficult area for faculty recruitment in community college education is the technical area. We all know this. There is a real wide gap in this area and it is not being treated in any of the colleges or universities that I know of except possibly the University of Michigan and Michigan State. Here in the east there has been some emphasis on training administrators, deans, and presidents. There are some programs available in the areas of the liberal arts, if I may use that term. However, in the new and growing areas of technology, the growing edge of education, there is no one doing anything, and the community college is pretty much left on its own.

I offer this word of advice which we found useful in New York State. As more of these institutions develop and grow strong in regard to their programs and faculties, they will provide some of their own education and bypass the universities because the universities are not ready for it, have not accepted it, and are not prepared for it. I am not thinking of Lehigh; they will be.

I am saying community colleges can set up their own educational programs. Not just on a single campus, but regionally in one of the larger community colleges. In a summer program, you can bring in representatives of industry and business. I am not particularly concerned with the techniques of teaching but with the currency of technical information.

I'll take one that offers illustration, that of electronics. We are fortunate enough to be situated in an area with a large business and industrial organization called "*I*'ve *B*een *M*oved." In fact this is the largest IBM installation in the country. Therefore, we should have a pretty good electronics program, and I think we do. But it could be a lot better. This summer we ran a workshop in cooperation with IBM, and we had about twenty-two instructors from eighteen community colleges in attendance. We were the sponsors. We did our own job of in-service education, not just for ourselves, but also for community college brethren in technical education. Now in the immediate future, and in the few years ahead until the universities catch up with the graduate areas of technology, the community college must help itself or loose the battle. This may be an idea which should in all of the eastern states. It certainly has had a good deal of usefulness in the State of New York.

DEAN BERNREUTER: I just want to point out that the prospects for university action are not quite as barren as Dr. Hall indicates. Penn State did turn out about thirty people as instructors in community colleges, trained in the technologies. We think this is a decent start in this direction.

DR. HALL: I'm delighted to know that. I shall certainly want to write you for details.

Questions to the Panel

Question: Dr. Hall mentioned in his talk that there may be some areas in technology that are in vogue now but may not be necessary tomorrow due to continuing changes in technology. If we hire a technical specialist to teach programs which become extinct later, what do we then do with the teacher?

DR. HALL: I didn't come prepared to answer that question, but I'd like to tangle with it a minute. What we are really talking about is technological unemployment which will not only happen to these professions but also to many other areas as we move along in this rapidly changing period of the next ten years. You must contend with AAUP, tenure, and a few other things that we, as administrators, are not eager to handle, but I think with reassignment and retraining this can be resolved within a particular faculty within a particular college. Of course, there will be cases where it can not be resolved, however, in the vast majority of cases some answer can be found.

For example, we are phasing out a program in our college, and I am very unhappy about phasing it out because it has real merit. For some reason it has not made itself felt because of a change in our society or because the program may have merit only in a four-year institution. I am referring to chemical technology. There is a tremendous demand for chemical technicians but we have not enrolled the number that we would like to have and we haven't for several years. On our staff we have three very well qualified chemists, two of which I can use on our regular staff, but I don't know what to do with the third young man. He happens to be a very good mathematician and physical scientist, so we will find a place for him as we phase out our program.

Another more difficult problem may be that of dental assisting. We have such a program, and it is very successful, but thinking of ten years from now, I don't know. In the future a computer may do it. If dental assisting goes out, what would we do with the dental assistant? This would be a more difficult problem. But I think that there is no problem with industrially related technologies. These men have a technology besides the specialty which they can teach. Business related technology can result in an easy phasing over into other specialties. Paramedical technologies may be a difficult area as this field changes, and it can change because things ten years from now may look quite different. You have to struggle with this problem, but I don't think it is unsolvable. I don't know whether I've helped you with your question, but this is what I believe.

MRS. KESALIS: What is happening in the field of retraining women? We are all familiar with the work being done under the auspices of the Ford Foundation at Rutgers in mathematics and chemistry, but what is being done in other places? We women who have raised our families and took programs several years ago are a little bit rusty. Maybe we could come back and help out.

DR. STOOPS: Some of the universities with which I have consulted concerning training programs for community college teaching rely on the fact that there are a great many people such as you describe who are completing a specific phase of their life and are now available to prepare for teaching. Programs for the preparation of such people are not designed so they must begin again at the beginning. If a person has a Master of Arts in an academic field and is admitted to teacher training at the graduate level, the program provides for transition from their present activity to full professional status as a community college teacher. After screening, the candidate is given any additional academic training thought to be needed, some didactical training, and a supervised internship. The program which Berkeley has used is of that nature. The program at Lehigh is of that nature.

We are interested in talking with women who have advanced degrees but have been occupied in recent years with their families. One of the services the university can render is to provide a reasonable program of training which will bridge across to a period of professional service. I agree with you. Many such women have careers of fifteen or twenty years to give to a community college. One problem, however, is that community colleges are not scattered so thickly that one can assure a woman of an internship or a position in a college located in her own community. We must tell her that she may have to move, but often she replies, "Oh, no, I can't move." This is the problem which limits the extent to which we can rely on our reserve of well-educated women to help us with the growing demand for teachers in community colleges.

SUMMARY
of Presentations and Discussions

DONALD DEPPE

ACCORDING to Dr. Christensen's comments at the beginning of the Conference last evening, we have now arrived at the difficult point of "re-entry." As your "astronaut" in charge of this most difficult maneuver, I tremble slightly at the awesome responsibility and pray that our "heat shield" will hold up so that no one will get burned in the process. While we've been orbiting in the ethereal reaches of the philosophy and program of the community college, I have noticed a polite avoidance of underlying political realities on the part of most of our speakers. In my informal conversations with participants in this Conference, however, I have discovered that political problems hold a prominent place in the concerns of many. As one beginning recommendation, I suggest that sometime in the future this valuable Conference be followed by a Practicum in the Political Realities of the Community College Movement. But before I become too concerned with comments and recommendations let me proceed with my major assignment of summarization.

I think that I should warn you of two dangers in connection with my task. In the first place, I stand as an outside observer with little competence or experience in the community college field, but with a keen interest in this exciting new dimension in higher education. My observations should be taken not as those of an expert but as those of an interested layman. Secondly, I find it impossible to summarize without interpreting at the same time. I will not only be reporting about things that I heard but about the way that I heard them. Furthermore, I do not intend to repeat everything that I heard, and in the very process of selection, I will be revealing my own opinions about what was particularly interesting and noteworthy.

In his keynote address, Dr. Meder informed us that the community college is characterized by its two-year organization, its identification with a local and readily identifiable community, and its position *within* the mainstream of higher education. Dr. Meder contended that the institution is within higher education if its program consciously serves adults, not children; if its preeminent concern is with subject matter in depth as well as breadth; and if its educational mission is discharged within a mystical (or did he mean mystifying?) community of scholars, and based upon "the hallmark of higher education", i.e. the spirit of the liberal and liberalizing studies.

Dr. Blocker, in a paper rich in historical background and philosophical perspective, informed us that the community college is typically committed to a liberal rather than a conservative position with regard to social change and the role of higher education in social change. While Dr. Meder found the hailmark of higher education in the "liberal spirit" and the climate it creates, Dr. Blocker clearly implied that even universities (which claim to embody and express the zenith accomplishments of higher education) are themselves resistant to most attempts to modify their own internal structures and educational programs. Against this background of the university's recognized and deeply entrenched conservatism toward its own house, it seems that one can view the community college in sharp relief as a useful tool in the hands of a society which "summons," according to Dr. Stoops terminology, an educational revolution in terms of expanded opportunity and flexibility of program in higher education.

Since I've already found it impossible to refrain from engaging in interpretive comment, let me continue for a moment in that vein. As one looks at higher education developments superficially, and that's the only view I profess to have, it appears to me that the community college stands alone in affirming two distinct commitments: 1) It is committed to the development of people rather than to pure research or the development of new knowledge, as Dr. Blocker pointed out. 2) According to Dr. Meder, it is committed to the community, a commitment so extensive that the needs of the community determine the nature of the educational program. Dr. Hall emphasized this same point when he talked about "the people's college" which is responsive to the demands and needs of the people. I shall have more to say about Dr. Hall's comments later.

These commitments are good, noble, and effective so long as the administrators, faculty members, and trustees of community colleges do not fall into the trap of directly emulating or making invidious comparisons to the university. What do I mean by this? In the first place, while many thoughtful university academicians will accept and admire the validity of commitment number one, some will regard it with apparent disdain as not being too important in what is *higher* education. Research competence, according to these individuals, is the hallmark of the academic man and if he can also teach, so much the better. Secondly, the community college movement will have greater difficulty, in my opinion, making a case for commitment number two. That the community should shape the institution of higher education and its program, is anathema to the smug and complacent high priests of academic orthodoxy. They are horrified at the very thought of soiling their garments of self-righteousness through accidental, let alone deliberate, contact with the defiling Philistines of the marketplace. An institution of higher learning, according to them, must never abdicate its leadership role to the community, but must insist on its divine right of self-determination.

Now all of us here know that this position is somewhat overdrawn if not patently false. We may be tempted to think that such medieval ideas no longer exist, but I think they do. Nevertheless, we've come to realize that this age-old question of whether society shapes the school or whether the school shapes society is not a simple either-or matter. There are forces which flow in both directions across the boundary which separates the school from its social setting. Some analysts of social organizations have said that institutions do not have rigid and inflexible boundaries but are surrounded by semipermeable membranes.[1] In terms of our present problem, it may be safe to say that the university has a less permeable boundary than that of the community college, and as a result, the community college is more sensitive and responsive to the forces in the community which cry out for educational reform.

My point here is really very simple. If community college leaders allow their sense of well-being to rest solely upon the applause and approbation of the university scholar, they will be disappointed again and again. My challenge is also simple and straightforward: Stand on your commitments. If these commitments represent differences—long live the differences! Don't worry about the accusations of those like Robert Hutchins that "the junior college has been taken over by the vocational trainers and other devoted, but misguided men who think the aim of education is to fit people into jobs." Just go ahead and fit people into jobs, creatively, and in a liberal spirit of course, with full assurance from Dr. Meder that accrediting associations no longer aim at establsihing uniformity, but at rewarding innovative approaches to new educational needs and problems.

Thus far, I've been dealing with the papers presented at this Conference in chronological order. I would like, however, to depart from that procedure at this moment, talk about Dr. Stoops' paper, then come back to the one presented by Dr. Hall because I feel he gave me an opportunity to close in my strong suit. In the interest of time, I will refer only to a few of the many valuable observations which Dr. Stoops made in his paper regarding the nature, recruitment, and training of community college faculty members. According to Dr. Stoops, the community college must have a faculty capable of judging its own competence, operating effectively in a diversified program serving a wide range of student ability, and relating well to the community which supports and shapes the institution.

Regarding the issue of self-determination, which I've chosen to emphasize in this summary, Dr. Stoops seems to be saying that the community college must be self-determining to the minimal extent that its faculty be allowed to evaluate its own performance. I would like to endorse heartily this position and caution community college leaders to avoid being shackled by a teacher-certification system which may be useful in elementary and secondary education but is insensitive to the unique spirit and over-riding goals of higher education.

Dr. Stoops pointed out that while it is relatively easy to identify the content and train the teachers for the college parallel program, these problems become more difficult in relation to the technical program of the junior college. His recommendation of the device of the cooperative institute as a useful approach toward the solution of this problem is a good one as some of my own research has indicated.[1] In examining non-credit programming for adults in forty-one American universities, it was possible to identify and document an interesting pattern of establishing new curricula or graduate chairs within universities. The typical progression of events was as follows: First, a conference or institute organized around a given subject of concern; second, a non-credit course lasting over a longer period of time, and taught with greater emphasis upon exploring the problem in depth; third, a credit course approved by the university senate; fourth, an undergraduate curriculum emerged; and finally, a graduate department came into existence which was concerned with the same subject matter. The point is simply this—one good way of moving community college teacher preparation into the central concerns of the university is the cooperative institute approach suggested by Dr. Stoops.

---

[1] *Erving Goffman,* Asylums: Essays on the Social Interaction of Mental Patients and Other Inmates *(Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Co., Inc., 1961), pp. 119-123.*

Two distinct problems emerge in this connection which community college administrators and board members should recognize, and which have bearing upon the problems of teacher recruitment and retention. In regard to teachers in the technical programs, the major problem seems to be one of identification of a content. Programs aimed at a solution of this problem can well be launched through the efforts of master teachers in community colleges to gain the interest and support of their university counterparts. For teachers in the college parallel program, the problem is not so much one of identification of a content, but identification *in* a career. So long as the community college teacher of English, History or Philosophy regards the university professor as the symbol of ultimate occupational achievement, the retention of able teachers in these subject areas will be a very real problem for the community college. There are many people in our secondary schools who can be attracted easily to the more prestigeous ranks of the community college faculty, but even apart from the danger that these people may have adverse effects upon the character of the community college as an institution of higher education, what is to keep these upwardly mobile educators from striving subsequently to the still higher aspirations of university employment? Steps can be taken by community college administrators and board members to make community college teaching more attractive, such as making salaries more competitive with those offered by four-year institutions and taking deliberate steps to create a climate of prestige and acceptance in the community for their college and its faculty. Other more practical considerations may occur to you as you think about this problem, and it is conceivable that we will need to stop at nothing short of revolutionizing the entire academic pecking order.

I come finally to the paper of Dr. Hall who said among other things, that the uniqueness of community colleges lies in the fact that they may be structured so "that they become a unifying factor for economic, political, and social activities." These institutions may serve as "catalytic agents" for social progress. Dr. Hall reminds us that however we define the unique relationship of the community college to its community, the result is obviously not one of abdicating leadership on many social fronts. While Dr. Hall did not have time to tell us in detail how the "people's college" is to provide this leadership role, he has given us a great deal of food for thought. It seems to me that a great deal of prestige could be added to the community college enterprise, and a high degree of satisfaction realized by its faculty, if both community college leaders and community leaders would come to see the very real role that a community college can play as a catalyst for the political and social betterment in its environs.

---

[1] *Donald A. Deppe,* The Conference Director as a Boundary Definer of the University *(Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1965).*

I am most grateful to Dr. Hall for the fact that he identified adult education as a separate and major function of the community college. If time permitted, I could make a strong case for the unique role of the community college in higher general adult education, but I think that some of the facts are already well known to many of you. Let me cite just one interesting statistic pointed to by McLain for the period 1936-1952.[1] During that period freshmen and sophomore enrollments in junior colleges doubled. During the same period adult enrollments in the evening and extension activities of community colleges increased sixteenfold, from 20,750 persons to 321,330. The period 1936-1952 is almost ancient history, but I have no reason to believe that the growth differential today is any different. In four year institutions, where I feel somewhat more competent to speak, non-credit adult education programs have grown between the years 1960-1963 at a rate 28.6 per cent faster than undergraduate degree program enrollments, and all of this in the face of an unprecedented growth in adolescent college enrollment.

In addition to the fact that general adult education through evening and extension activities is not only a large and potentially larger activity, it is also a highly significant activity. It is significant not only because of what an institution can do for an adult population more than ever committed to continuing its own education, but also to what this kind of programming can do for the institution which provides it. I'm afraid that too often we tend to think condescendingly of the great educational service which we perform for people while we fail to recognize the very real benefits which accrue to the institution itself. In addition to broadening the base of support of the community college, the adult education program will result in the improvement of the college's faculty. I think there is an obvious advantage to faculty members when they are given the opportunity to test their theoretical formulations in a face-to-face encounter with mature minds enriched by their contact with the work-a-day world. Through an evening or extension program you will also be able to identify competent individuals in the community whose teaching talents will enrich the total program of the college. I could go on with an endless list of advantages to both institution and client of vital adult education programming, but in the interest of time, I will hurry on to my concluding remarks.

I would like to close with a relevant observation made by Mr. McGeorge Bundy in the January 1962 issue of *Harper's Magazine*. Mr. Bundy, as many of you know, is the former Dean of Arts and Sciences at Harvard University and was appointed during the Kennedy administration to the position of Special Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs. Mr. Bundy still holds this position in the Johnson administration*, a position which has been described by many observers as one of the most influential in the political structure of our country. As a matter of fact, someone somewhere has said that Bundy has at last realized the dream of all college and university deans of becoming "dean of the world" (present company excluded, of course). At any rate, Mr. Bundy, in the Harpers article to which I've referred, tried to predict the most significant changes to take place in higher education during the years 1960 to 1975. Pretending that he was writing in 1975, Bundy described the five major changes that have taken place in higher education during the preceding fifteen years. "The greatest change of all" according to Bundy had to do with the university's commitment to continuing education; during these years we have come to see very clearly that the university, indeed the community college, "is not a place of full time effort by young students and old professors, but a home for hours, days or weeks at a time of all highly civilized men." From my prejudiced point of view, this is the idea I would like to leave with you even if all others escape you. Return to your tasks with a renewed commitment to make your institution, university or community college, a haven for the intellectually curious adults in your community for hours, or days, or even weeks at a time so that they might face their tasks with renewed vigor and sharpened intelligence.

---

[1] *Cited by Renee and William Peterson,* University Adult Education *(New York: Harper and Brothers, 1960), p. 60.*

Mr. Bundy has since resigned to accept the presidency of the Ford Foundation.

CONFERENCE PARTICIPANTS

BERNICE ARMSTRONG, Board of Freeholders, Hackensack, N. J.

FRED ARMSTRONG, Director of Research and Projects, U. S. Steel Foundation

JOHN H. ARNOLD, Vice-President, Air Products and Chemicals

DONALD BAGIN, Education News Service, Media, Pa.

JESSE R. BARNET, Assistant to the Executive Director, American Association of Junior Colleges

LOUIS BENDER, Director, Bureau of Community Colleges, Harrisburg, Pa.

R. G. BERNREUTER, Vice President for Student Affairs, Penn State University

J. WADE BINGEMAN, Director of Teacher Placement, Lehigh University

PAUL G. BLACKETOR, Dean, Keystone Jr. College

ALEXANDER C. BLAIR, Sales-representative, South-Western Publishing Company

JAMES R. BLAND, Board of Trustees, Anne Arundel Community College, Annapolis, Md.

CLYDE E. BLOCKER, President, Harrisburg Community College

ALLEN BONNELL, President, Community College of Philadelphia

C. E. BOYER, Superintendent of Schools, (Retired), Bethlehem, Pa.

RAYMOND B. BRASSINGTON, Vice-President, Easton Area Chamber of Commerce

LEROY BRENDLINGER, Consultant, Montgomery County Community College

THOMAS F. BRIODY, Western Electric Company, Allentown, Pa.

WALTON A. BROWN, President, Atlantic Community College

LESLIE R. BUNDGAARD, Assistant Vice-President for Academic Affairs, University of Maryland

NATT BURBANK, Associate Professor, Lehigh University

MRS. ROLAND BURDICK, League of Women Voters, New Jersey

AUGUST BUZAS, President, Bethlehem Area School Board

KENNETH CARL, President, Williamsport Area Community College

C. BERRY CARTER, II, Assistant to the Superintendent of Schools, Anne Arundel County Board of Education

JOHN CARTWRIGHT, Professor of Education, Lehigh University

A. R. CATRAMBONE, Superintendent of Schools, Camden Public Schools, New Jersey

CHARLES E. CHAFFEE, Superintendent, Bethlehem Area Schools

FRANK CHAMBERS, President, Middlesex Community College

JOHN CHEEZUM, Assistant Director, Institute of Research, Lehigh University

GLENN J. CHRISTENSEN, Provost and Vice-President, Lehigh University

A. T. CLAFFEE, Superintendent of Schools, Higher Education Commission, Burlington County, N. J.

JOHN F. CLOUGH, JR., Community College of Philadelphia

Jack H. Cooper, Associate Professor of Education Administration, Temple University
Reade W. Corr, Superintendent of Schools, Kent County Board of Education, Maryland
David S. Crocket, Dean, Lafayette College
Fred E. Crossland, Ford Foundation, New York City
Howard H. Crouch, Associate Professor of Education, Juniata College
Walter Dealtrey, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce
Charles H. Dennison, President, Cecil County Board of Education, Maryland
Donald A. Deppe, Director of Institutes, University of Maryland
Mrs. John K. deVries, Essex Falls, N. J.
G. A. Dinsmore, School Director, Bethlehem Area School District
D. James Donald, Chemistry Instructor, Essex Community College
Wesley M. Dorn, Director, Advisory Council for Higher Education, State of Maryland
Edward Edelman, Assistant Professor of English, Long Island University
Carl Y. Ehrhart, Dean of the College, Lebanon Valley College
William W. Evans, Vice-President, Anne Arundel Community College
Gerald S. Feldman, Sussex County College Committee, New Jersey
Mrs. Gerald S. Feldman, Sussex County College Committee, New Jersey
John A. Fielding, Administrative Principal, Salem, N. J.
Paul J. Fink, Superintendent of Schools, Allentown, Pa.
Bertha P. Fischer, Williamsport, Pa.
Robert D. Fleischer, Superintendent of Schools, Nutley, N. J.
Arnold Fletcher, Dean of Academic Affairs, West Chester State College, Pa.
Robert Frederick, Jr., Consultant for Two-Year College Programs, New York State Education Department
George H. Fritzinger, Vice-President, Lehigh Division, Pennsylvania Power and Light Company
Robert A. Gibson, Superintendent of Schools, Cecil County Public Schools, Maryland
W. L. Gillette, Department Chief, Western Electric Company, Allentown, Pa.
Harry W. Githens, Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.
Willard R. Grubbs, Director, Allentown Center, Pennsylvania State University
Charles W. Guditus, Director, Community College Intern Program, Lehigh University
James F. Hall, President, Dutchess Community College, New York
Byron Halstead, President, Halstead and Mitchell Company
Robert L. Hansen, School Director, Bethlehem Area School
Oliver E. Harris, Director of Development, Lycoming College
James P. Harrison, Superintendent of Schools, Glassboro Public Schools, New Jersey
James Harvey, Dean of Arts and Sciences, Inter-American University, Puerto Rico
W. W. Hassler, Dean, Indiana State College, Indiana, Pa.

W. George Hayward, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, East Orange, N. J.

Garo Hazarian, Guidance Counselor, Mountain Lakes High School, Sparta, N. J.

John A. Heske, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

William L. Hires, Assistant County Superintendent, Chester County Public Schools

George Hodson, President, Montgomery Junior College

Richard L. Holler, Assistant Superintendent, Cecil County Public Schools, Maryland

Edwin Howard, Jr., Burt and Hill Architects, Pittsburgh, Pa.

Harvey Huber, Director of Admissions, Kutztown State College, Pa.

Edward Ibsen, Principal, Sandyston-Walpack School, New Jersey

David S. Jenkins, Superintendent of Schools, Board of Education of Anne Arundel County, Maryland

Samuel M. Jenness, Superintendent of Schools, Westminster, Md.

David R. Johnson, Newtown, Pa.

C. Herschel Jones, Dean, Liberal Arts, Williamsport Area Community College

F. Taylor Jones, Executive Secretary, Commission on Higher Education, Middle States Association

Ruth A. Kaselis, Secretary, Somerset County Community College Planning Committee, New Jersey

Joseph F. Keimig, Staff Specialist, Advisory Council, Higher Education, State of Maryland

Dolores Keller, Professor, Farleigh Dickinson University

M. Kennet, Dropsie College, Philadelphia, Pa.

Atlee C. Kepler, President, Hagerstown Junior College

Jeffrey Kirk, Assistant Professor of Education, Lehigh University

Sheldon H. Knorr, Specialist for High School Education Information, Maryland Advisory Council for High School Education

Alfred Kramer, President, Chamber of Commerce of Allentown, Pennsylvania

Everett E. Kunkel, President, Board of Education, Sandyston-Walpack School, New Jersey

Oliver Laine, President, Catonsville Community College, Maryland

L. E. Law, Superintendent, Hamilton Township Public School, New Jersey

Robert Leight, Instructor in Education, Lehigh University

W. Deming Lewis, President, Lehigh University

Harold Martin, Board of Freeholders, Bergen County, N. J.

D. Bennett Mazur, Board of Freeholders, Bergen County, N. J.

Albert E. Meder, Jr., Dean and Vice-Provost, Rutgers University

Audrey Meyers, Assistant Director Public Relations, American Institute of Physics, New York

Francis J. Michelini, Dean of Academic Affairs, Wilkes College, Wilkes-Barre, Pa.

Andrew S. Moreland, President, Ocean County College, New Jersey

Paul Morton, Director of Public Relations, East Stroudsburg State College, Pennsylvania

MAURICE J. MURPHY, Duquesne University

MARVIN Z. MYER, Market Statistics Analyst, Pennsylvania Power and Light Company, Allentown, Pa.

S. A. NOCK, Dean of the College, Cedar Crest College

JOHN H. NORRIS, President, Board of Trustees, Anne Arundel Community College, Maryland

E. HARRY OCKER, President, Board of Education, St. Mary's County, Maryland

GERARD F. O'MALLEY, Assistant Superintendent of Schools, Millburn Township Public Schools, New Jersey

A. RUSSELL PARKHOUSE, Montgomery County, Pa.

JEAN L. PASCOE, Guidance Director, Newton High School, New Jersey

M. A. PATTISON, Assistant County Superintendent, Lawrence County Schools, Pennsylvania

GLADYS C. PEARLSTINE, Secretary, Montgomery County Chamber of Commerce

JOSEPH PESOTINE, Trustee, Williamsport Community College

ESTOY REDDIN, Assistant Professor, Lehigh University

H. D. REESE, Assistant Director of Certification and Accreditation, Maryland State Department of Education

CHRISTOPHER J. RHINES, Educational Consultant, Maryland Advisory Council for Higher Education

HARRY C. RHODES, Superintendent, Queen Anne's County Board of Education, Maryland

LLOYD RICE, Graduate Assistant, Lehigh University

J. A. RICHARDS, Dean of Instruction, Community College of Philadelphia

ADRIAN H. RICHNER, Assistant Director of Admissions, C. W. Post College

ALICE RINEHART, Graduate Assistant, Lehigh University

R. M. RINN, Chief Product Engineer, Sprout Waldron and Company

JAMES V. ROBERTSON, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

CHARLES E. ROLLINS, President, Bucks County Community College, Pennsylvania

ALBERT SALDUTTI, Director, Essex County Board of Freeholders, New Jersey

NORMAN SAM, Director of Summer Sessions, Lehigh University

WILLIAM J. SAMPLE, President, Cumberland County College, New Jersey

LEONARD SAUNDERS, Superintendent, West Morris Regional High School, New Jersey

CHARLES SAYLOR, Dean, Westminster College, Pennsylvania

EDWARD SCANLAN, Associate Professor, Lehigh University

HILDA SCHOENWETTER, Associate Professor of Art Education, Moore College of Art, Philadelphia

WARREN F. SCHUMACHER, Chairman, Study Committee, Hunterdon County, New Jersey

MRS. LEONARD SCHWAB, American Association of University Women, Bethlehem, Pa.

C. GLENN SEELHORST, Clerk-Auditor, Camden County, New Jersey

RICHARD W. SELTZER, Superintendent of Schools, Lower Moreland Schools, Pennsylvania

F. K. SHIELDS, Ebensburg, Pa.

A. **Shimer**, President, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

Samuel B. **Shirk**, Director of Admissions, Albright College

John B. **Shuart**, President Board of Education, River Edge Public Schools, New Jersey

John M. **Siegel**, Physician, Education Committee, Allentown Chamber of Commerce

Louis L. **Siegert**, Trustee, Anne Arundel County Community College, Maryland

Charles G. **Simpson**, State Council of Higher Education, Pennsylvania

Stephen B. **Sims**, Superintendent of Schools, Leonia, Public Schools, New Jersey

Chester H. **Sloat**, Pennsylvania Military College

James S. **Snoke**, Assistant County Superintendent of Schools, Allegheny County Schools, Pennsylvania

Fred A. **Snyder**, Assistant Dean of Students, Harrisburg Area Community College

Harold P. **Snyder**, Superintendent-Principal, High Point Regional High School, New Jersey

Robert H. **Spohn**, Consultant, Essex County Community College Committee, New Jersey

J. F. **Sterling**, Eastern District Manager, South-Western Publishing Company

John A. **Stoops**, Dean, School of Education, Lehigh University

Philip H. **Storch**, Education Editor, Call-Chronicle Newspapers, Allentown, Pa.

Blossom **Tepper**, Graduate Assistant, Lehigh University

Harold **Thomas**, Lehigh University

Thomas E. **Toale**, Haddonfield, N. J.

G. Raymond **Todd**, Superintendent of Schools, Northampton County, Pa.

H. K. **Trend**, General Secretary, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

Mitchell G. **Uram**, Trust Officer, Pittsburgh National Bank

William F. **Walker**, Vice Chairman, Butler County Community College, Pennsylvania

James **Whildin**, Chairman of Education Commission, Bethlehem Chamber of Commerce

E. L. **Wilkinson**, Director of Manufacturing, Avco Corporation

Mrs. D. Ellwood **Williams, Jr.**, Board of Trustees, Anne Arundel Community College, Maryland

Preston A. **Wilson**, Associate Director, Pennsylvania School Boards Association

Leonard N. **Wolf**, University of Scranton, Pennsylvania State Board of Education

John B. **Wright**, Vice-President, Board of Trustees, Anne Arundel Community College, Maryland

W. Ross **Yates**, Dean, College of Arts and Sciences, Lehigh University

John E. **Yingling**, Superintendent of Schools, Howard County, Maryland

H. M. **Zondel**, Secretary, League of Women Voters, New Jersey

R. S. **Zimmer**, President, Allegany Community College, Maryland

CONFERENCE COMMISSION

Bender, Louis W., *State Director of Community Colleges,* Department of Public Instruction, Harrisburg, Pa.

Bundgaard, Leslie R., *Assistant to Vice President for Academic Affairs,* University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Christensen, Glenn J., *Provost and Vice President,* Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Cosentino, Andrew J., *Assistant to the President,* Trenton Junior College, 101 S. State Street, Trenton, N. J.

Ehrbright, Lee L., *Acting Dean,* Montgomery Junior College, Takoma Park, Md.

Guditus, Charles W., *Director, Community College Intern Program,* Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Hornbake, R. Lee, *Vice President for Academic Affairs,* University of Maryland, College Park, Md.

Meder, Albert E., Jr., *Dean of the University,* Rutgers, New Brunswick, N. J.

Pritchett, John P., *President,* Trenton Junior College, *Vice President,* Junior College Council of Middle Atlantic States, 101 South State St., Trenton, N. J.

Stoops, John A., *Professor and Dean of School of Education,* Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

Yates, W. Ross, *Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences,* Lehigh University, Bethlehem, Pa.

CONFERENCE STAFF

Jesse Barnet, *Assistant to the Executive Director,* American Association of Junior Colleges
Louis Bender, *Director, Bureau of Community Colleges,* Pennsylvania State Department of Public Instruction
Clyde E. Blocker, *President,* Harrisburg Area Community College
Allen Bonnell, *President,* Philadelphia Community College
Walton A. Brown, *President,* Atlantic County Community College
Glenn J. Christensen, *Provost and Vice-President,* Lehigh University
Donald Deppe, *Director of Institutes,* University of Maryland
Charles W. Guditus, *Director, Community College Intern Program,* Lehigh University
James Hall, *President,* Dutchess County Community College
W. Deming Lewis, *President,* Lehigh University
Albert E. Meder, Jr., *Dean and Vice-Provost,* Rutgers University; Chairman
H. D. Reese, *Assistant Director of Certification and Accreditation,* Maryland State Department of Education
Charles Rollins, *President,* Bucks County Community College
Charles Simpson, *Chairman,* Pennsylvania State Council of Higher Education
John A. Stoops, *Dean, School of Education,* Lehigh University
Leonard Wolf, *Professor,* University of Scranton; *Member,* Pennsylvania State Board of Education
W. Ross Yates, *Dean,* College of Arts and Sciences, Lehigh University

Production Notes

This book on *The Community College in Higher Education* was designed and produced under the direction of the Lehigh University Office of Publications, Alumni Memorial Building, Lehigh University.

The text is Old Style and the headlines are in Baskerville, designed by the 18th Century English printer John Baskerville. The text is linotype and was set by the Globe-Times Printery, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania. The book was printed on Hopper's Sunray Vellum Opaque by the Globe-Times Printery, Bethlehem, Pennsylvania.